Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-205
Wednesday
23 October 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-205 *23 October 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NOTICE TO READERS: The United States Government recognizes the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Arms Control & Disarmament

Grinevskiy Cited on Vienna Arms Talks *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 1

Worldwide Issues

Grachev Gives Foreign Ministry News Briefing 1
Remarks on 'Disinformation' *[TASS]* 1
Gorbachev's Middle East Agenda *[TASS]* 1
Grachev on CPSU Financing *[TASS]* 2
Speaks on SFRY Crisis *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 2
Grachev on Responsibility for Honecker Actions *[Berlin ADN]* 2
Yavlinskiy Describes IMF Talks in Bangkok *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 2
IMF Session Viewed *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 3
Observer Questions International Role *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]* 5

Northeast Asia

Volskiy, Japan's Nakao Discuss Economic Aid *[TASS]* 6
Downed Korean Airliner Wreckage Discovered *[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]* 6
Japan Seeking Air Link to Kurils *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Oct]* 6

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev on 'Misgivings' Over Cambodian Peace *[TASS]* 7
Further on a Cambodian Settlement *[INTERFAX]* 7

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Minister Pankin Ends Mideast Tour 8
Meets Mubarak, Leaves for Paris *[TASS]* 8
Favors 'Gradual' Arms Cuts to Region *[TASS]* 8
Holds Talks With 'Arafat in Paris *[Radio Rossii]* 8
Belonogov Previews Peace Talks as 'Difficult' *[TASS]* 8
Belonogov Receives Tunisian Ambassador *[TASS]* 9
Iran 'Uncompromising' on Madrid Peace Talks *[Moscow International]* 9
Shaposhnikov Receives Iranian Ambassador *[TASS]* 9
Indian Opinion Split on Relations With U.S. *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 10

East Europe

Gorbachev Condemns Hungarian Invasion *[Budapest Radio]* 10
Gorbachev Greets Free Enterprise Forum *[INTERFAX]* 10
New Romanian Government in 'Difficult' Way *[IZVESTIYA 18 Oct]* 11
Shaposhnikov Receives CSFR Ambassador *[TASS]* 11

West Europe

Pankin Reviews Tasks of Paris Visit *[Moscow TV]* 11
Further on Visit Schedule *[TASS]* 12
FRG Justice Minister on Honecker Extradition *[INTERFAX]* 12
Views Honecker Issue With Officials *[TASS]* 12
Troop Withdrawal From Germany Unsatisfactory *[Hamburg DPA]* 12
Military Food in Germany To Be Shipped Back *[Moscow TV]* 13
British Embassy Driver Confesses as Spy *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 13
Pardoned Soviet Denies 'Spying' in Italy *[TASS]* 13
CPSU Aid to Finnish Party Confirmed *[TASS]* 13

Latin American & Caribbean

Committee for Cuban Rights Established *[INTERFAX]* 14

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Further Comments on Economic Treaty Signing 15
Gorbachev Sure Others To Join *[INTERFAX]* 15
Leaders Appeal to Ukraine *[TASS]* 15
Opens 'Door to Normal Life' *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 16
Republics Discuss Debts, Foreign Relations 16
Agreement on Foreign Debt *[INTERFAX]* 16
Soviet-U.S. Relations *[INTERFAX]* 17
Union Foreign Ministry 'Coordinator' *[INTERFAX]* 17
State Security Organs Reorganization Outlined 17
KGB Officially Abolished *[TASS]* 17
Bakatin, Stepashin on Future *[MOSCOW NEWS 6-13 Oct]* 17
Shevardnadze on Republics, Democratic Movement *[TRUD 22 Oct]* 19
Committee Links Ligachev With Coup Plot *[AFP]* 21
Another Putsch Predicted for Late Spring *[MOSCOW NEWS 13-20 Oct]* 21
CPSU Uses State Funds for 'Special Purposes' *[ROSSIYA 2-8 Oct]* 23
Alekseyev's Powers Reinstated by Decree *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Gorbachev on Land Reform, Price Parity *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 23 Oct]* 26
War, Labor Veterans' Aims Registered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Oct]* 27
TASS Carries Press Reviews 27
21 October *[TASS]* 27
22 Oct *[TASS]* 28

Military

Reforms, Military Doctrine, Morale Discussed 29
Kobets Comments *[TASS]* 29
No 'Long-Term' Policy *[IZVESTIYA 18 Oct]* 30
No Progress in Chemical Warfare Destruction *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 32
Baltic Fleet Commander on Troop Withdrawal *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]* 33

BALTIC COUNTRIES

Baltic Affairs

Baltic Leaders Seek U.S. Development Concepts *[BALTFAX]* 34

Estonia

Economy Needs 'Outside Help' *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 34
National Service Bill Discussed *[BALTFAX]* 35
Authorities Enunciate Citizenship Demands *[BALTFAX]* 36

Talks With USSR To Open 10 Nov *[BALTFAX]* 36
Intention To Join IMF, World Bank Noted *[BALTFAX]* 36

Latvia

Godmanis on World Bank-IMF Delegation's Tasks *[Riga International]* 36
USSR Bank No Longer Responsible for Operations *[Moscow TV]* 36
Minister Notes Problem Traveling to Republic *[Riga Radio]* 37

Lithuania

Citizenship Decision Deadline Draws Closer *[BALTFAX]* 37
Vagnorius Stresses USSR Stability *[TASS]* 37
Landsbergis Evaluates Belorussian Talks *[BALTFAX]* 37
Prunskiene: Landsbergis' Rule 'Authoritarian' *[TASS]* 38
Economy Dependent on USSR Stability *[TASS]* 38
Soviets Prevent Danish Plane From Landing *[Radio Vilnius]* 38

RSFSR

Supreme Soviet

Communists Fuel Parliament-Yeltsin Conflict *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 39
No Candidate for Soviet of Republics Chairman *[Radio Rossii]* 40
Rutskoy Announces Formation of Customs Service *[INTERFAX]* 40
Fedorov Views Hearing on CPSU Role in Coup *[Moscow TV]* 40
Parliament Considers Judicial Matters, Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Paper Reports 16-17 Oct Session Proceedings *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 Oct]* 41

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Appoints More Regional Representatives *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 22 Oct]* 42
Evidence Shows Ligachev Involvement in Coup *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Justice Minister Levels Charges Against CPSU *[INTERFAX]* 42
Prime Ministerial Candidates Assessed *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 Oct]* 42
Deputies Prepare for Republican Congress 43
TASS Assesses Legislative Scene 43
Khasbulatov Previews Issues *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 22 Oct]* 44
Democratic Communists Hold Regional Conference *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 44
Economy Official Discusses Currency Reform *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 Oct]* 45
Judges Complain of 'Pressure' From Deputies *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 22 Oct]* 46
Concern Voiced Over Russia's Ethnic Policies *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 46
Lawmen Under Investigation in Racket Case *[Moscow TV]* 48
Lopatin Calls For Russian Defense Structures *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 48
National Guard Initiator Comments on Project *[Moscow TV]* 50
Privatization Efforts Termed 'Unsatisfactory' *[INTERFAX]* 50

Local Affairs

Sharp Increase in Tension in Chechen-Ingushetia 51
IZVESTIYA Update on Events *[22 Oct]* 51
Rallies Protest Using Force *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Kaliningrad To Cut Exports of Consumer Goods *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct]* 52
Islamic Culture Association Founded in Kazan *[INTERFAX]* 52
Formation of Far Eastern Republic Considered *[INTERFAX]* 52
Komi Official Resigns Over Coup Accusations *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Tatarstan Persists in Fight for Independence 52
Parliamentary Talks To Resume *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 52
Paper Deplores Tone of Struggle *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 53
Leader Urged To Declare Sovereignty *[TASS]* 53
Tataria Continues Supreme Soviet Session 54

Sabirov Presents Economic Report *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Private Land Ownership Approved *[TASS]* 54
Yakutia Signs Pact With Baykonur Cosmodrome *[INTERFAX]* 54

External Affairs

Crimean Peninsula May Become Next 'Hot Spot' *[Moscow TV]* 54
Parliament May Threaten Georgia With Sanctions *[INTERFAX]* 54

International Affairs

'Rossiya' Group Against Extraditions to Latvia *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Oct]* 55
Gorbachev Greets Entrepreneurs Conference *[TASS]* 56
Yeltsin Receives Bulgarian President Zhelev 56
Leaders on Economic Cooperation *[TASS]* 56
Delegations Conduct Talks *[TASS]* 56
Sides Term Meeting Successful *[TASS]* 56
Agreement Set for Signing 23 Oct *[INTERFAX]* 57
Japanese Trade Minister Arrives in Moscow *[TASS]* 57
Kunadze Views Soviet-Japanese 'Concessions' *[Moscow International]* 57
Kaliningrad Leaders Back Sakhalin on Kurils *[Kaliningrad Radio]* 58
Burbulis Meets Anti-Castro Opposition Group *[Russian TV]* 59

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

Shushkevich Interviewed on Economic Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Talks Begin on Lithuanian Bilateral Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Landsbergis Views Talks *[Minsk Radio]* 60
PRAVDA Comments on Land Ownership Law *[8 Oct]* 60
Citizenship Eligibility Requirements Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 61

Moldova

Dnestr Appeals for Place in 'Renovated Union' *[TASS]* 61
Pridnestrovye Appeal for Union Admission Noted *[TASS]* 61
Economic Treaty Signing 'in Principle' Favored *[TASS]* 62

Ukraine

Prime Minister Supports Economic Treaty *[TASS]* 62
Supreme Soviet Session Proceedings Detailed *[Kiev International]* 62
Defense Minister on Republican Forces *[Moscow TV]* 63
'Strategic-Purpose Forces' Discussed *[TASS]* 64
Prime Minister Fokin Visits Brazil *[Kiev International]* 64
Trade Negotiations Noted *[INTERFAX]* 64
Delegation Ends Visit *[TASS]* 65

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Gamsakhurdia Assails Democratic Reformists *[Moscow TV]* 66
Gamsakhurdia: Shevardnadze Imposing Communism *[INTERFAX]* 66
Gamsakhurdia Warns of 'Lebanonization' *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 11 Oct]* 66

Armenia

Ter-Petrosyan Makes First Legislative Address *[Radio Rossii]* 69

Azerbaijan

Negotiator Says Armenia Must Rescind Acts *[INTERFAX]* 70

Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast

Peacekeeping Force Deployment Suggested *[INTERFAX]* 70
Shots Fired at Interior Ministry Helicopter *[TASS]* 70

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev Supports 'Association' Based Union *[TASS]* 71
Economic Situation 'Drastically Deteriorating' *[INTERFAX]* 71

Tajikistan

Presidential Elections Postponed Until 24 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Muslim Leader Comments on Aspirations *[Moscow TV]* 71
Supreme Soviet Lifts Islamic Party Ban *[INTERFAX]* 72

Turkmenia

Niyazov Comments on Economic Treaty *[TASS]* 72
Democratic Party Meets To Outline Program *[TASS]* 72

Uzbekistan

President Karimov Joins New Party *[TASS]* 72

Arms Control & Disarmament

Grinevskiy Cited on Vienna Arms Talks

LD2210104591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 4

[Report by correspondent I. Melnikov: "'All Animals Are Equal...' How Orwell Is Being Quoted at Disarmament Talks"]

[Excerpt] One more round of the Vienna talks—both those at which confidence-building measures are being worked out and those which are discussing ways of reducing conventional arms in Europe—has come to an end.

The participants in the former talks at the end of the fall round were obliged to admit self-critically that their achievements are not commensurate with the recent disarmament initiatives put forward by the presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union. The only hopeful point is that headway has been made in Vienna in creating a network of direct communications among the CSCE states. As for the main task—preparing a new package of "confidence-building measures" for the "Helsinki-2" meeting (it is scheduled for March 1992)—here there is still a lot to do.

But what happened at the latter talks? Oleg Grinevskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation, is convinced that there is headway on the main salient—in the elaboration of an agreement on the limitation of the numerical strength of personnel. Virtually all states submitted figures for the numerical strength of their armed forces and gave explanations for these figures. The coinciding elements in structures became clearer, as did existing differences.

Some things were clarified also in vexed issues. For instance, in the establishment of the rule of sufficiency. The opinion has strengthened in the Soviet delegation that the partners have given serious thought to the practical applicability of this idea. How to ensure that national limitation levels accord with the universally recognized principle of defense sufficiency? And how to ensure precisely that the formula of sufficiency for some does not result in overarmament for others. [passage omitted]

Worldwide Issues

Grachev Gives Foreign Ministry News Briefing

Remarks on 'Disinformation'

LD2210163391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1521 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Nikishov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—Andrey Grachev, an aide and head of the press service of the head of state, has called a number of items in the Soviet media relating to the activities of the USSR President "disinformation."

At a briefing today in the USSR Foreign Ministry, he cited "several cases of blatant and regrettable distortion of facts"—specifically, in the magazine OGONEK on the question of the publication in the German magazine DER SPIEGEL of information on the investigation of the participants in the August putsch. Andrey Grachev also mentioned the newspaper KOMMERSANT, which, "by half-hint and half-assertion" expressed a view to the effect that the leak of information on the progress of the investigation "was organized by services of the USSR President's apparat." The newspapers LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS were also named.

The head of the press service stressed additionally that he "does not dispute the right of any journalist to his own opinion nor the legal right of any news organ to its own standpoint."

Gorbachev's Middle East Agenda

LD2210161991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1532 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondents Sergey Nikishov and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—The USSR is attaching exceptionally great importance to the Middle East peace conference, which is to open in Madrid on 30 October, Andrey Grachev, head of the USSR president's Press Office said at a briefing today. "We are hoping," he said, "that the conference will be able to yield some concrete results while promoting the beginning of an effective process for the construction of just and genuine peace in the Middle East, a process which would find solutions to the problem of relations between the Arab countries and the state of Israel, as well as to the Palestinian problem."

The head of the USSR president's Press Office said that Mikhail Gorbachev will fly to Madrid on 28 October to take part in the official opening ceremony of the conference. On 29 October he will hold a working meeting with U.S. President George Bush, and hold talks with the Spanish leaders. Among the members of the Soviet delegation taking part in the conference will be Boris Pankin, the USSR foreign minister; Yegor Yakovlev, member of the USSR president's Consultative Political Council, and USSR Gosteleradio chairman; Vladimir Lukin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economy Relations; and some experts of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Grachev on CPSU Financing

LD2210172391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1558 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Nikishov and Igor Peskov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—[Passage omitted] Speaking about the USSR president's working schedule for the next week, in particular, about his international contacts, Andrey Grachev said that on 23 October Mikhail Gorbachev will receive the president of the French "Total" oil company; meetings with Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is arriving in Moscow, and deputy ministers of finances of G-7 member countries are planned for the end of the week. On 28 October, Mikhail Gorbachev will meet with George Vassiliou, President of Cyprus. [passage omitted]

Answering a question on CPSU cooperation with friendly parties abroad in the financial sphere, Andrey Grachev admitted that there had been a practice when, in accordance with instructions and decisions of party bodies, "Certain Soviet state structures, on quite advantageous conditions, cooperated with or financed the activity of corresponding structures in Western European countries," which worked in close contact with political parties, including Communist Parties. In his words, this practice had never been a secret but "It had almost never been a question of direct cooperation between the financial and managerial bodies of parties."

Speaks on SFRY Crisis

LD2210185191 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1758 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, Oct 22 (TANJUG)—Speaking at a regular news briefing this evening, the Soviet president's press spokesman Andrey Grachev did not rule out the possibility that President Mikhail Gorbachev might again meet with the presidents of the Yugoslav Republics of Serbia and Croatia, Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman, "if the situation should make it necessary."

Grachev specified that Gorbachev might meet with Milosevic and Tudjman together or separately.

Grachev said that, during the meeting with Milosevic and Tudjman last week, Gorbachev had "shown not only political commitment but personal commitment as well and an intention to make every effort which might be of use in mediating a peaceful solution to the Yugoslav crisis."

Grachev went on to say he believed Gorbachev would discuss the problem of Yugoslavia with U.S. President George Bush in Madrid on October 29.

No specific agenda has been fixed for the meeting, but the two presidents want to review questions of the greatest concern, one of which is likely to be Yugoslavia, he said.

Grachev on Responsibility for Honecker Actions

LD2210211491 Berlin ADN in German 1910 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—For the first time, the Soviet Union has explained its refusal to hand over Erich Honecker, the former GDR head of state, saying that it bears a share of responsibilty for his actions.

Andrey Grachev, spokesman for the Soviet president, today told the RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY: "We must consider all of the aspects of the Honecker question. From a political and moral point of view, we cannot react in a completely detached manner to what happened in the GDR, which also happened while defending the Warsaw Pact's border. For this reason, we cannot react rashly on this question without clarifying our responsibility for what happened during the cold war years." Grachev reaffirmed the Soviet point of view that the dispute over Honecker's presence in the USSR has to be settled "in accordance with the law and in a humanitarian way."

Yavlinskiy Describes IMF Talks in Bangkok

PM2210144591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 Union Edition p 2

[M. Berger and I. Demchenko report: "G-7 Will Soon Come to Us"]

[Text] The Soviet delegation, which had been participating in the annual IMF forum, returned from the capital of Thailand on 19 October. The IMF session was preceded by a meeting of the finance ministers of the seven most industrially developed countries of the world, which was also held in Bangkok. The main topic of discussion at both conferences was the situation in the Soviet Union.

Answering questions from IZVESTIYA's correspondents, Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, leader of the Soviet delegation, pointed out that the main thing achieved in Bangkok was mutual understanding between our country and the West in questions of support for the Soviet reforms.

The IMF, of which we recently became an associate member, is the largest financial institution, whose chief tasks—the stabilization of money circulation, the struggle against inflation and financial crises, problems of the repayment of foreign debts, and questions of credit—accord in the best possible way with our vital requirements. Working under the IMF's roof are major world experts, whose recommendations are invaluable to us. But, for the IMF and the G-7 countries to be able to give effective support to the Soviet reforms, they need to

have a clear picture of the state of the Soviet economy, the demarcation of responsibility, and the essence of the processes taking place in our country and of our future plans. And the fact that even with the present internal instability the sides managed to understand each other and to agree on further steps is a big achievement for the group of economists representing our country.

The Western world voiced a number of wishes, whose fulfillment will promote further cooperation and, at the same time, does not run counter to our internal interests. These include the signing of the republics' economic treaty defining their further relations, the elaboration of a clear program of specific reforms, for which they are prepared to allocate to us the necessary funds, the determining of responsibility with regard to paying off the USSR's foreign debt, and the bringing of the state of statistics into line with world norms. Commenting on the latter circumstance, G. Yavlinskiy pointed out that it is a question not of revealing any of our secrets but merely of going over to standards which are the same for all and which, in the opinion of Western specialists, are the only grounds for elaborating correct decisions. It is characteristic that the best understanding of Soviet statistical problems was shown by the representatives of Germany, who are still experiencing difficulties with their analysis of the situation in eastern districts.

As already reported, a decision was adopted in Bangkok that the deputy finance ministers of "the seven" countries will come to the Soviet Union at the end of October. It is planned that during this meeting there will be a direct discussion with the leaders of all the republics, which will enable the sides to decide on questions of further cooperation. In addition, the West expressed readiness to assign experts to assist in preparing specific agreements in respect of the Economic Community Treaty and in elaborating a program of economic reforms.

G. Yavlinskiy described the attitude of "the seven" and the IMF toward our country as a most-favored nation regime. And this is fully confirmed by statements by representatives of the West. For example, U.S. Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady, who on the eve of the Bangkok meeting had expressed uncertainty about questions of giving aid to the Soviet Union, told THE NEW YORK TIMES after the end of the forum that "we are ready to do everything possible for the Soviet economy, and as soon as it is necessary."

IMF Session Viewed

PM2210162591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 91 p 5

["View From Moscow" by Anatoliy Karpychev: "As for the Dollars... We'll Have To Wait"]

[Text] This time it was by no means the exotic beauty of the far-off city of Bangkok, capital of Thailand, that attracted attention. That took second place in the face of the invasion of prominent financiers—and they don't travel the world merely for the sake of it.

The finance ministers from the G-7—the world's richest countries—discussed a number of problems, including the "Soviet" problem. Or what aid they will be able to offer the Soviet Union to enable it to survive the "hard winter of its transition from communism to capitalism." The bankers continued their discussion of aid at the annual session of the world's leading financial organizations—the IMF and the World Bank. Financiers received information about the situation in our country—without which the discussion would have been futile—from Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and his team, who flew out to Bangkok as the official Soviet delegation.

The IMF, which quite recently used to call the "world financial gendarme," is of extreme interest to us today. We are insistently asking for a place in it, but they are not very keen to admit us. The point is that the IMF helps its members get out of financial difficulties. The World Bank grants sizable credits for economic development, something that we need urgently. But since we are not "part" of these organizations, we don't have the right to count on their resources...

A glimmer of hope appeared at the well known G-7 meeting in London this July, where Major, Bush, Mitterrand, Kohl, Kaifu, Andreotti, and Mulroney discussed the subject of aid for the USSR. For the first time in the "heavyweight club's" history they invited the USSR president to the banks of the Thames. He accepted the invitation. After what was dubbed the "seven plus one" meeting we began to talk about admission to the IMF and a breakthrough in economic cooperation. This has constantly lagged behind political dialogue and disarmament. There were various reasons for this, among them our sluggishness with reforms, the chaos in the country, and unpredictable behavior. I must say that there are also sentiments like those harbored by U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney: No one in the West will feel a passionate desire to offer considerable aid to a country that still has 27,000 nuclear warheads pointing at the United States.

London got things moving. We came to Bangkok in a different capacity from that in which we went to the Thames. At the beginning of October the Soviet Union became an "associate" member of the IMF. We would like to become a "full general," a full-fledged member of the fund—we made that request but, regrettably, some leaders opposed such a rapid turn of events, President Bush included. Why? A full member of the IMF would have to be given credit, and that is risky with the USSR, which the business world sees as a "black hole" gobbling up dollars without repaying them. Nevertheless, the newspapers reported that after 70 years of isolation the USSR is becoming an associate member and has gained access to the "secrets of capitalism's success."

"Most likely, a difficult and risky economic reform, a unique reform has begun," IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus noted calmly at a press conference.

Incidentally, he acknowledged that our country has colossal manpower resources and skilled specialists and he reckons that it is very important to pass on to the USSR the experience and knowledge that the IMF has accumulated over the last 45 years. But what we want is dollars.

In Bangkok there was a serious discussion, albeit nothing new, about how to pass this experience and knowledge on to us. The G-7 deputy finance ministers' trip to the USSR will be the first practical step. According to reports from Bangkok, they will discuss with Soviet leaders the plan for economic reform and study the current state of the financial system. That means, specialists note, that the G-7 countries are starting to help the Soviet Union in the same way as they help debt-ridden developing countries.

I do not rule out the possibility that some of our readers will dislike the fact that the powerful men of this world failed to get out their checkbooks in Bangkok. It is evidently high time we grasped the fact that the "rules of the game" are somewhat different for Western financiers than they were for our financiers. It is high time we accepted their "game" and their "rules" rather than taking pride in our incompetence. Incidentally, people in Bangkok took note of the Soviet delegation's statement that it had not come to beg for dollars. That attests to a great deal, above all to our intention to go the whole way, however difficult it may be, from "associate" member of the IMF to "full general" with the opportunity and right to take out loans.

Do we realize that this is a difficult road and that whether we cover it depends in part on our behavior and our actions? It is not our fault, but our problem that we are not trained in Western "rules of the game." However, we have learned something else: how to sink money into projects with no return. We spent that money ruthlessly, without remorse since it was public money, not our own, and no one had to report back to the taxpayers as to how it was spent. Today times have changed, but, regrettably, our mentality has in many respects remained the same.

Even today a certain contempt for competence and professionalism can still be sensed. The years are passing, there is more and more work, including with foreign partners, but we still have few men capable of unorthodox and, I stress, state-minded thinking. The well known actor Leonid Filatov expressed this perfectly, in my view: "We've got masses of Robespierres, but no one to do the work..."

A period of Robespierres is splendid, but it cannot go on forever. Especially in the economy. There is evidently no room for Robespierres here. Is that not why Western businessmen cannot understand what has happened to our common sense? They in the West pool their efforts, while we, on the other hand, divide them. The West is interested in our single economic space and in preserving a renewed Union, while some of our Robespierres are prepared to tear absolutely everything to pieces. It is no coincidence that French Finance Minister Pierre Beregovoy commented in Bangkok: "We first want to know who our interlocutors are."

Incidentally, that is no rhetorical question. The G-7 has its own problems as well as ours. Disagreements emerged in the Thai capital between the powerful of this world regarding the "fair international distribution of the burden" of aid to the USSR. Helmut Kohl spoke about this in particular. Further, we arrived in Bangkok with debts. In the opinion of Western sources, we have an acute shortage of hard currency, we don't have any hard currency to pay out within the next six weeks "to repay a debt of roughly $5 billion." Which interlocutor will pay—the republics or the center? Yavlinskiy seems to have reassured the financiers on this—we will pay.

After their meeting with the Soviet delegation the G-7 formulated a communique. The world's financiers acknowledged that the USSR and the republics are encountering serious economic difficulties and financial problems. It is evident from this communique that our representatives welcomed the steps taken by the G-7 and other countries to offer us humanitarian, food, and medical aid. The document also stipulates the conditions with which we must comply in order to broaden cooperation.

There were plenty of conditions even before Bangkok. How should we regard them? Not as an ultimatum. I, for instance, resolutely oppose the ideological conditions that, incidentally, politicians often lay down. But we must take into consideration the conditions of business partnership, the rules of the IMF, and the procedures for joining the international organizations, otherwise there will simply be no partnership.

It is time we grasped the fact that businessmen do not invest dollars from party coffers in business, but their own hard-earned cash. And, when a state decides to help the USSR, it provides businessmen with guarantees that their money and labor will not be lost or expropriated, as happened in 1917. Chaos is the enemy of capital. Capital and unpredictability are poor bedfellows. That is why the G-7 reiterated their conditions, of which we are aware in principle: all-embracing reforms and clearly defined commitments on the part of the center and the republics to implement all financial commitments in a timely manner.

So what conclusions can be drawn from Bangkok? The West generally wants to help us. Voices can be heard increasingly louder calling for various restrictions imposing limits on us to be lifted and for us to become full-fledged members of the IMF and be able to receive credits. But... first of all we must straighten out our own house and restore order there.

Observer Questions International Role

PM2110132391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by observer Aleksandr Golts: "What Kind of Role Are We Playing?"]

[Text] This week's main international events force us to wonder yet again what kind of a country we are actually living in. At first glance they convince us that this country is a power which enjoys considerable prestige in the world and has marked influence. Thus, the USSR president, acting in the role of mediator, managed to get the leaders of Serbia and Croatia to sit down at the same table in Moscow. Moreover, a communique was signed containing a demand for the immediate cessation of hostilities without any conditions which, it is true, did not lead to their cessation.

And in Jerusalem talks have begun between USSR Foreign Minister B. Pankin and the Israeli leadership and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. One of their chief aims is to ensure the speediest convening of a Near East peace conference. Here the White House press secretary has already announced that the Soviet and U.S. president may take part in the opening of this conference.

And so are we still playing the role of a great power? Unfortunately, other events show that we are only playing this role. And we are playing it in a strained manner since the further matters progress the more obvious it is that this role is simply beyond us.

After all for all the acuteness of the problems in whose settlement Soviet diplomats are taking part with some success, these problems have only a most indirect bearing on our life. As for what is in my view the main foreign policy task, that is all-around assistance in overcoming our very grave crisis, here we cannot talk of any successes.

The world hopes to see in us a reliable and understandable partner. And this is completely failing. And the reason here is obvious. Just as in terms of the number of exchanges we have achieved one of the first places in the world (which for some reason has not led to a surplus of goods) so in terms of the number of foreign policies we confidently lay claim to a place in the Guinness Book of Records. With approximately the same result as that achieved by the exchanges.

Take nuclear disarmament. The USSR president has come out with the well known initiatives in response to G. Bush's proposal. The workers of the Union Foreign Ministry have confidently stated at news conferences that these initiatives are elaborated jointly with the republics. But the Russian foreign policy department deemed it necessary to come out with its own ideas. I do not intend to discuss whose initiatives, the Union or Russian initiatives, are better. I am simply quite unable to understand the logic of those who compel our partners on each occasion to wonder who they should actually deal with in this country.

Especially as the pointless games around Soviet nuclear weapons are continuing even after the republics' agreement has seemingly been reached on this score. I cannot believe the report which has appeared in our press that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Government has allegedly discussed the possibility of exchanging nuclear strikes with the Ukraine. And the official denial published yesterday in our newspaper convinces us that sensible people are working in the Russian leadership.

But the newspaper "canard" which flew out of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI puts us on guard because it is not the only one on this subject. It looks as though this wildfowl is already intending to join into flocks. At virtually the same time the British newspaper THE INDEPENDENT, citing V. Shlykov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR State Committee on defense questions, reported that the United States is, it turns out, already supplying Russia with elements of an abm system. In order allegedly to protect the RSFSR from missile attacks from the territory of other sovereign republics. Washington reacted instantly, resolutely denying this report. As for V. Shlykov, who is in Italy, TASS also published his denial, from which it emerges that it was a case of the already well known U.S. proposal on joint participation in the development of an ABM system. And it is not for nothing, indeed not for nothing, that THE INDEPENDENT again wrote that "contradictory statements on this question show how difficult it is to ascertain which of the numerous Soviet and Russian officials is reporting truthful information." You must agree that in this situation it is hard to count on trust from the West.

And Soviet participation in an international measure which does indeed have direct bearing on us all looks like the very climax of inconsistency. After all it was here that there was talk of forms of assisting the economic resurrection of the USSR. I have in mind the Bangkok session of the IMF and the World Bank and also the meeting of the finance ministers of the "seven" which preceded it. Let it pass that the Soviet delegation allowed itself to be late (it is true that this gave one Western representative the right to say that "today they are late for their aircraft, tomorrow they will forget to pay their debts"). Something else is worse. In the opinion of THE TIMES the Soviet representatives "did not always know what they wanted and were not always certain what their powers were."

Is it not these circumstances which predetermined the results? Once more the Soviet representatives were listened to with attention. Once more they were told that the industrial countries are prepared to support Soviet reforms. And the deputy finance ministers will come to Moscow soon to elaborate a program on this score. And

that is all. It looks as though they did not reach agreement on the deferment of our debt payments. And the "seven's" communique stated frankly that to preserve its credit-worthiness the USSR must begin to implement an all-embracing program of economic reforms. And in this case I would not identify the West's approach with the situation described in the well-known anecdote. Learn to dive, they say, and then we will give you water. After all we are asking for billions in credits. And for all its love of democracy, for all its desire to stabilize the situation in a nuclear power, the West must know to whom exactly it is supplying these credits and who precisely will pay them back.

Unfortunately, the time has gone when our foreign policy was to a certain extent independent of the domestic political situation. Today it is perfectly obvious that without resolving fundamental questions concerning the state system it is impossible to count on foreign policy activity becoming a help in finding a way out of the situation in which we find ourselves right now.

Northeast Asia

Volskiy, Japan's Nakao Discuss Economic Aid

LD2310111591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1915 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Vasiliy Titov]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—Arkadiy Volskiy, deputy chairman of the USSR Committee for the Operational Management of the National Economy, has called the Japanese Government's decision to grant economic aid to the Soviet Union an important step toward resolving all the problems existing between the two countries. He voiced this opinion during a conversation held today with Eiichi Nakao, the Japanese minister for foreign trade and industry. The meeting formed part of Nakao's working visit to our country and was devoted to discussion of the principal directions of bilateral economic cooperation.

Eiichi Nakao spoke of his country's willingness to work together with the Soviet Union in pursuing a structural reform of the Soviet economy, converting defense factories and developing small and medium-sized business. He gave a number of specific recommendations on these issues.

The minister also gave notice of Japanese entrepreneurial interest in developing economic links with the far-eastern region of our country and with Sakhalin, referring especially to the Sakhalin project to exploit an oil and gas field. Eiichi also noted that if the tenders commission awards work to the Soviet-Japanese joint venture "Sodeko," then Japan will extend most-favored terms to this venture.

Arkadiy Volskiy praised the Japanese side's proposals, but at the same time regretted that economic cooperation between the two countries remains to this day at such a low level. His opinion is that cooperation in, for example, defense-industry conversion could be entirely realistic and promising. The USSR would be willing to forward to the Japanese side a list of specific proposals, including on the complete sale of individual enterprises formerly engaged in military production.

The deputy chairman of the USSR Committee for the Operational Management of the National Economy praised Japan's intention of channeling a proportion of the credits it has granted into developing the Soviet oil-extraction industry. He also reminded the Japanese minister of proposals to exploit two oil fields in Siberia and the Transbaikal region, put forward by the Soviet side during the visit by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to Tokyo. "I hope," said Arkadiy Volskiy, "that Japan will look more closely at these proposals, which are highly beneficial to it."

Downed Korean Airliner Wreckage Discovered

PM2210203991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

["IZVESTIYA Expedition Has Discovered Remains of Downed Boeing on Seabed"]

[Text] On 22 October at 0600 Sakhalin time, the ship Gidronavt made for a spot in the Tatar Strait assumed to be above the remains of the South Korean Boeing 747 that was shot down by a Soviet Su-15 fighter eight years ago. When the autonomous "Tinro-2" apparatus, piloted by Captain Mikhail Girs, was lowered and submerged for the first time, it came up with an excellent result: The massif where the remains of the liner were scattered. Certain objects from KAL-007 were immediately brought to the surface with the assistance of a robot arm.

Japan Seeking Air Link to Kurils

PM2210145391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 3

["Cable for Today's Paper" report: "Without So Much as Asking the Kuril Islanders"]

[Text] The Japanese Government and the Hokkaido authorities have begun studying the possibility of opening direct air communications between the island of Hokkaido and the Northern Territories, as the southern islands of the Kuril chain, which are claimed by Japan, are called here. Thus the exchange of letters [obmennyye pisma] signed behind the backs of the Kuril islanders by the Japanese and USSR foreign ministers means that by as early as the end of the current year inhabitants of the four islands of the South Kuril chain and Japanese citizens will carry out group trips in either direction without visa registration.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev on 'Misgivings' Over Cambodian Peace

LD2310113991 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 23 Oct 91

[By special correspondents Georg Mikhaylin, Georgiy Shmelev, and Viktor Khrekov]

[Text] Paris October 23 TASS—"A political settlement of the protracted bloody conflict in Cambodia is a great achievement for the world community made possible after substantial normalisation of the international situation and, primarily, because of the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States," Igor Rogachev told TASS today. He for a long time headed the Soviet delegation at the talks on the Cambodian peace process.

Cambodia, as the world community hopes, will become a democratic, independent, non-aligned and neutral state. Rogachev described the Soviet Union's relations with it as quite promising.

"Our relations have always been good, including the years when Prince Norodom Sihanouk was in power. Over the past decade we have made a big contribution to the rehabilitation of the Cambodian economy," Rogachev said.

"I believe we will also have good relations with the country's new leadership, most likely to be headed by Sihanouk again. I had several occasions to meet him over slightly more than a year. The prince told me that he retained the kindest memories of Soviet people and would like to visit the Soviet Union in his new capacity".

Rogachev admitted the Soviet side has misgivings about the peace process after an agreement on a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian conflict is signed.

"No one gives guarantees there will be no complications. For example, in recent days, quite unexpectedly to all participants in the Paris conference on Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge began to bring displaced persons into the country from Thailand in contravention of documents that have already been agreed upon and will be signed today. They are doing it specially to influence the outcome of the forthcoming general parliamentary elections.

"I think, participants in the Cambodian peace process are paving the way for a resolution of the Middle East problem. Mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States is a major prerequisite of that. I hope this will also play an important role at the Madrid conference on the Middle East," Rogachev said.

Further on a Cambodian Settlement

OW2210182591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1513 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Paris is hosting an international conference on Cambodia, which involves 18 states, including the Soviet Union. During the first two days the delegations were finishing up the final documents, drafted by the UN Security Council's five permanent members. On October 23, the documents are to be signed by the foreign ministers, who lead the delegations, and by UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar. "What does Moscow expect of the Paris conference?" DP [Diplomatic Panorama] asked at the USSR Foreign Ministry's Department for the Far East and Indochina.

"We hope that the regional conflict in Cambodia will be settled and the general situation in Southeast Asia and in Asia and the Pacific in general be improved," said one of the Department's executives. This is the main goal of the Soviet Union, he added.

Asked about the possibility of gaining any benefits, the diplomat said that "prestige" was the only thing the Soviet Union could gain. He said that as search for settlement continued, a mechanism of mutual dealings among the Security Council's five member-states was created. This is the "capital" the Soviet Union is trying to build up, he said.

Asked if Phnom Penh will start paying its debts to the Soviet Union as a result of the Paris agreements, the diplomat said that the Soviet side "works to ensure legal continuity of the Cambodian side." In practical terms this means that the new Cambodian leadership, the Supreme National Council led by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, recognizes all the commitments of its predecessor—the State of Cambodia. The Foreign Ministry official expressed hope that Moscow's efforts will be successful. He also said that Cambodia's debts to the Soviet Union are much smaller than those of Cuba or Vietnam. Now that the USSR is experiencing enormous economic difficulties, however, it would be an inadmissible luxury to lose this sum, homever small.

He expressed regret about the fact that the Soviet business quarters and entrepreneurs are oriented exclusively to the Western industrialized states, leaving Cambodia and Indochina as a whole outside the field of their vision. Meanwhile, he said, settlement in Cambodia is opening good prospects for mutually advantageous trade. "There's a great deal we can import from Cambodia: rubber, coffee, and valuable kinds of wood," he said. "It looks like our business people do not intend to use the new opportunities," he said in conclusion.

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Minister Pankin Ends Mideast Tour

Meets Mubarak, Leaves for Paris

LD2210141191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1056 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By special correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 22 Oct (TASS)—A meeting has taken place here between USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin and President Husni Mubarak of Egypt.

The talks opened with the situation in the Soviet Union and adjusting international efforts to help overcome the existing difficulties. When it was necessary, you helped us, Husni Mubarak said. Now it is the turn of the world community to help you. The Egyptian president expressed confidence that the Soviet Union is and will remain a great power.

The prospects for the Madrid peace conference were discussed against a wide background of the history of the Near East conflict and attempts to settle it. The hope was voiced that a measured and constructive approach by the sides and patience and persistence will make it possible to arrive at positive results.

Issues concerning bilateral Soviet-Egyptian cooperation, especially in the economic sphere, were examined.

The talks between the Soviet minister and the Egyptian president were marked by complete mutual understanding and a warm and friendly atmosphere.

The same day Boris Pankin left Cairo for Paris.

Favors 'Gradual' Arms Cuts to Region

LD2210151791 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By special correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo October 22 TASS—The Soviet Union favours gradual cuts in arms supplies to the Middle Eastern region, Foreign Minister Boris Pankin said today. He added that if the forthcoming Madrid peace conference on the Middle East produces positive results, those supplies may discontinue altogether.

Pankin was speaking to reporters before flying out of Cairo after talks with Egyptian President Husni Mubarak and Foreign Minister 'Amr Musa.

He said final agreement on sending invitations to participants in the peace conference, which was done in cooperation with U.S. Foreign Secretary James Baker, is among the practical results of his trip to the Middle East.

Commenting on the conference, Pankin said: "Our slogan is as follows: All disputes, all conflicts, all grievances, and mutual recriminations traded by the sides should be transferred to the negotiating table. The sides have seen that, strictly speaking, they can nothing to lose [as received], while they can gain a lot. This is the key to this conference."

Pankin expressed confidence that Soviet Middle Eastern policy is conducive to stronger relations with Arab countries. He said he felt well during talks with foreign leaders: Nobody wants the Soviet Union to retire from the political arena.

"All understand perfectly well that all our troubles and all our problems are problems of maturing. The union of sovereign states remains and will continue to be a great power. The world needs it. We came to feel this also here," Pankin said.

Holds Talks With 'Arafat in Paris

LD2210214591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2100 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister Boris Pankin, who arrived in Paris today, met Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. When their conversation ended, a joint report was circulated for the press. It reads as follows:

An in-depth exchange of views on a broad range of issues concerning the Middle East settlement took place. It was stressed that the opportunity created by the Madrid peace conference must not be missed. After his conversation with Boris Pankin, 'Arafat answered questions from TASS correspondents. He said: We place high value on Soviet-Palestinian relations and on the efforts being coordinated at various levels with a view to advancing the cause of a Middle East settlement. With great satisfaction, we noted immediately that the invitations to the conference had been sent to its participants on behalf of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush. All this provides a new impetus to our prolonged march toward peace.

Belonogov Previews Peace Talks as 'Difficult'

LD2210164591 Moscow TASS in English 1549 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov on Tuesday [22 October] told TASS talks at the Middle East peace conference in Madrid will be very difficult and even dramatic.

He said the conference scheduled for October 30 will include plenary sessions and direct bilateral talks between Israel and its Arab partners.

Special working groups have been set up to hold direct talks between Israel and Syria, Israel and Lebanon and Israel and the joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.

Belonogov said the Jordanian delegation will focus on Jordan's problems and Palestinians will hold separate talks on the Palestinian problem.

"The Middle East peace conference aims to ensure a comprehensive settlement, which cannot be confined only to solving the territorial problem," Belonogov said.

The restoration of diplomatic ties between the Soviet Union and Israel will boost the Soviet Union's role as an "active, capable and hopefully successful co-chairman of the Middle East peace conference," the diplomat said.

He said the Soviet Union will not develop its relations with Israel at the cost of Arab countries.

Belonogov Receives Tunisian Ambassador

LD2210172191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—Deputy USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov today received the Tunisian ambassador to the USSR Salaheddine Abdallah at the latter's request. According to the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, matters relating to the Middle East peace conference opening in Madrid on 30 October were discussed.

Iran 'Uncompromising' on Madrid Peace Talks

NC2310055891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Persian to Iran 1430 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary]

[Text] In his speech at the international conference in support for Palestine, 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani stated that Iran is prepared to start a jihad for the liberation of Palestine's occupied territories. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes:

Iran's stance on the upcoming Middle East peace conference can be summed up in two words: no reconciliation. Tehran for some time now has been conducting an active diplomatic propaganda campaign aimed at preventing the convening of this international conference. The first step was taken some months ago when the joint U.S.-Soviet statement proposing a Middle East conference was published. At that time, the Iranian Foreign Ministry issued a statement in which it described this proposal as harmful and without prospects.

We then witnessed a series of speeches by second-rank political figures, and naturally, all of them opposed the convening of the Middle East peace conference. Then the heavy artillery entered the arena last week. Majlis Speaker Mehdi Karrubi, who became the leading attacker, not only condemned the upcoming Madrid conference, but also cited from Imam Khomeyni's remarks some time before his death when he said that Palestine's liberation only can be achieved through an armed struggle. Now, after such a preparation of public opinion, the president himself stated his view and said that Iran is ready to start a jihad and to send its Armed Forces to Israel.

In order to gain support for its stances, Iran has recently organized the International Conference in Support for Palestine with the participation of 400 representatives from 45 countries. Obviously this conference is taking place as a counterpoint to the upcoming talks in Madrid. Countries that have any type of ties with Israel have not been invited to Tehran.

Meanwhile, we should say that Iran's uncompromising stand on a solution of the Middle East problem is not a priority issue. On the contrary, almost all countries believe in the need for the Madrid conference. This conference is not one of the whims of Moscow or Washington but is a political reality. First of all, the protracted confrontation showed that the Palestinian problem cannot be solved through the use of force because this will lead to an impasse. Second, in an impasse, a solution is possible only through reconciliation and compromise. The issue now is not one of surrender by the Arabs, but the objective of the conference is to seek decisions that are acceptable by all sides. Third, for the first time in many years, an extremely favorable international atmosphere has been created for untying the Middle East knot.

Practically everyone is ready for the talks. Syria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and the Palestinians have announced their readiness to participate in the Madrid conference. The decision to convene this conference is the outcome of the search for a way out of a multifaceted problem, and life itself has made the Arabs and Israelis sit at the negotiating table.

Shaposhnikov Receives Iranian Ambassador

LD2210201191 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Oleg Moskovsky]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Air Force Marshal Yevgeny Shaposhnikov today received the Iranian ambassador to Moscow, Nematollah Izadi, at the latter's request to discuss issues of mutual interest.

Noting traditionally good, neighbourly relations between his country and the Soviet Union, Izadi told TASS that the discussion confirmed the two countries' mutual interest in developing these bonds.

Indian Opinion Split on Relations With U.S.

PM2310093791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 91 p 5

[Vladilen Baykov article under the "Correspondent Comments" rubric: "India-United States: Backdrop to a Visit"]

[Excerpts] Delhi—Admiral C. Larson, commander of the U.S. Navy in the Pacific, has visited Delhi. An ordinary event by and large—there are lots of visits at this level between the states. But the press reports that this visit has been given special resonance in the Indian capital. [passage omitted]

Thinking about the future, U.S. strategists see India as the main maritime power in the region, and friendly relations with it would be a factor of some importance for safeguarding U.S. strategic interests.

The recent dramatic changes in the international arena and, largely, the Soviet Union's loss of its role as one of the two superpowers have particularly speeded up the process of mutual rapprochement. Some politicians in Delhi, who until recently did their utmost to underline the "special nature" of Soviet-Indian relations, now seem to have seen the light and are saying that "it is foolish to put all your eggs in one basket." The views of some high-ranking Defense Ministry officials are consonant with this stance; they reckon that India is too dependent on the Soviet Union, the Indian Army's main arms supplier. In their opinion, THE TIMES OF INDIA writes, the former close contacts with the Soviet Union should no longer be considered a matter of course. It is in India's interests to improve relations with the United States.

Unlike the military, various political parties, including the Bharatiya Janata Party [BJP], which was always regarded as pro-Western, are taking a more skeptical view of the idea of close military cooperation with the United States. That step, BJP leaders think, may bring about a total change of India's foreign policy course. Therefore, before adopting this major decision, there must be careful and lengthy study of the world's changing strategic and geopolitical realities.

Left-wing parties, including the Communist Party of India and the Communist Party of India, Marxist, are talking in even more definite terms. They oppose any agreements that may bring about a withdrawal from the Nonaligned Movement. They think that developing countries should do their utmost to reinforce the nonaligned camp in the current multipolar political world where the United States has assumed the role of international gendarme. India should play a leading role in this movement.

East Europe

Gorbachev Condemns Hungarian Invasion

LD2210191491 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian 1500 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] The Soviet head of state and his spokesman said that the Soviet leadership regards the Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956 as contrary to international law. Zoltan Tamasi reports from Moscow:

[Tamasi] It is absolutely clear and obvious that Gorbachev and the Soviet leadership regard the Soviet intervention in 1956 as a violation of the international legal norms. This is what the Soviet head of state's spokesman told Radio Hungary. Grachev pointed out that no such Soviet steps can be repeated. This is a direct consequence of the new way of thinking that has gained ground in the Soviet Union since 1985. The spokesman did not give details as to since when it has been clear and obvious that Gorbachev condemns the deployment of the Soviet Army in Hungary in 1956, for no official document confirms this as yet. When will it? According to Grachev, it is conceivable that a good opportunity will be provided for this, too, by the signing of the Soviet-Hungarian treaty, expected in the near future—in other words, when we agree on the future, then we can also clarify the past satisfactorily.

Gorbachev Greets Free Enterprise Forum

OW2310015891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Entrepreneurs from central and eastern Europe opened a forum in St. Petersburg's Tavrichesky Palace on Tuesday [22 October]. The forum organizers, the St. Petersburg Center for Assistance to UNESCO and the Association of East European and Asian Entrepreneurs, said their goal is to work out a mechanism of effective assistance to businessmen in the USSR and other East European countries.

President Mikhail Gorbachev's message of greeting to the forum said that new and exceedingly favorable conditions for mutually beneficial international cooperation had been created in Europe in recent years.

Britain's ex-premier Margaret Thatcher said she would do her best for East European nations to receive the financial assistance, know-how and consultations they had requested from the West. Mrs. Thatcher censured the EEC leadership for its recent statement identifying the influx of goods from the ex-socialist countries into the West European markets as "undesirable."

The forum has brought together over 500 delegates of business groups in the ex-Soviet republics, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania.

New Romanian Government in 'Difficult' Way

PM2210131591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Oct 91 Union Edition p 5

[By correspondent V. Volodin: "Romania: New Government"]

[Text] Bucharest—Before introducing the members of his Cabinet to parliament, new Romanian Prime Minister T. Stolojan said that his government would continue the process of economic reforms and democratization of Romanian society and wage an implacabale battle against theft, speculation, and corruption. Stolojan's predecessor, P. Roman, had talked about this only recently.

More and more people in Romania are realizing that only by creating a healthy market economy will the country be able to clamber out of the morass of problems and enter Europe as an equal partner, not as a perpetual suppliant, as a poor relation. Judging by what the new premier said, the cabinet intends to begin by improving the currency, finance, and credit systems. Particularly as the question of the limited convertibility of the Romanian leu has featured on the agenda more than once already. It is thought that this step will raise the prices of already expensive imported goods which have kept Romanian goods out of the stores. But the government hopes that it will be able to prevent runaway inflation and keep the economic situation under control. To that end it is intended in the very near future to take the block off funds in banks, revitalize credit policy, make enterprises work by encouraging small and medium-sized producers, accelerate the transfer of land to peasants, privatize state housing, and reform the banking system.

It is hard to say whether the government, elected for the six months until the next general election in Romania, will have time to do all this. Particularly when you consider that Stolojan's cabinet, with winter on the way, is in a more difficult position than its predecessor, which inherited from the previous regime over $1 billion, accumulated by Ceausescu.

Now the coffers are empty, and the latest miners' march on Bucharest put an indefinite freeze on Romania's receipt of Western credits and the conclusion of advantageous deals. As a result electricity and fuel are in short supply again. The grain has not been harvested yet because of the lack of diesel fuel. There is still the possibility that it will be another cold, dark, and hungry winter in Romania. A number of industrial enterprises are probably going to have to stop work in order to save electricity. Assessing the current situation, T. Stolojan said that no one is going to pay for the population to make the transition to the market.

As for the composition of the cabinet of ministers, judging by reactions in the Romanian press it is seen as a compromise. The key ministries—foreign affairs, national defense, and others—will be headed by same ministers who served in the P. Roman government. They are National Salvation Front nominees. The opposition is represented in the government by four members of the National Liberal Party.

Shaposhnikov Receives CSFR Ambassador

LD2210133191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—USSR Defense Minister Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov today received Rudolf Slansky, the CSFR ambassador to the Soviet Union, at the latters' request. A friendly conversation took place in which issues of mutual interest were discussed.

"The USSR defense minister has acquainted me with the progress in the military reform being implemented in the USSR Armed Forces as well as with the position of the military leadership given that a number of sovereign republics have gained independence," R. Slansky said to a TASS correspondent.

West Europe

Pankin Reviews Tasks of Paris Visit

LD2210204991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 Oct 91

["TV Inform" report from Paris by correspondent S. Iyezuitov, with recorded interview with Foreign Minister Boris Pankin]

[Text] [Iyezuitov] As if on purpose, the French have decided to fight for their rights precisely these days. I hope their actions will not hamper other events that are to take place in the French capital. French television is reporting on the inconveniences for Paris and its visitors and giving advice on how to avoid them. In any case, this is one of the facets of French life that the Soviet minister of foreign affairs will see. [Video shows French medical staff protesting in the streets, Pankin welcomed at the airport]

[Addressing Pankin] Tell us, please, in what mood have you arrived in Paris, and what do you expect of meetings and talks with the French leadership?

[Pankin] I left the Near East in good mood and am fine in Paris. Well, you know, I have several tasks here. It is a kind of multilayered sandwich, because there is a conference on Cambodia and then a bilateral official visit and talks with the French leadership. Besides, there will be a meeting tomorrow with James Baker on issues of the Near East conference, the first since Jerusalem and, perhaps, the last before Madrid. So, there are very many things to think about. But Paris is always Paris, therefore, the feeling one has when stepping on its soil always inspires and helps to cope with all the tasks, whatever they are.

[Iyezuitov] Right after his arrival, Boris Pankin met Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee. In the conversation, issues linked to the preparation for the conference on the Near East due to open in Madrid on 30 October were discussed. The process of settlement has started. But nobody knows what reefs it can run into in its progress toward peace in the region.

Further on Visit Schedule

LD2210183491 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By special correspondents Viktor Khrekov, Vladimir Shvets, and Georgy Shmelev]

[Text] Paris October 22 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Boris Pankin on Tuesday [22 October] arrived in Paris for an official visit.

He will attend a session of the Paris peace conference on Cambodia, which is expected to sign an agreement on a political settlement in Cambodia on Wednesday [23 October].

Pankin will meet U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and representatives of other sides concerned to discuss the Middle East peace conference, which opens in Madrid on October 30.

He will also meet PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat, who will fly to Paris for talks with the Soviet foreign minister, Ibrahim Al-Sus, Palestinian representative in France, said.

Pankin is expected to meet UNESCO Director-General Federico Mayor and attend the 26th session of the UNESCO General Assembly to announce Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's message to its participants.

The Soviet foreign minister will also meet President Francois Mitterrand of France, French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, leaders of the French parliament houses Laurent Fabius and Alain Poher, Paris Mayor Jacques Chirac and French business people.

FRG Justice Minister on Honecker Extradition

OW2210195591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1648 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Germany's justice minister, Dr. Klaus Kinkel, has said his meetings in Moscow with his USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] colleagues yielded an agreement in principle on Erich Honecker's extradition.

In reply to a question from IF [INTERFAX] Mr. Kinkel did not specify what kind of punishment Mr. Honecker may expect for the killing of 4 people by GDR borderguards at the former border between East and West Germany. At the same time, he did not rule out that E. Honecker, who is considerably advanced in years, may be spared any punishment at all for reasons of health.

The German minister said his Soviet and Russian opposite numbers had positively reacted to the request for speeding up the exoneration of persons convicted by Soviet military tribunals on German territory in 1945-49.

Mr. Kinkel believes that Soviet-German cooperation, which received a new impetus after the failed coup attempt in the USSR last August, should be complemented with interaction in the sphere of justice. Specifically, Germany could open courses of training for lawyers from Russia and the Soviet Union.

Views Honecker Issue With Officials

LD2210181891 Moscow TASS in English 1557 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By diplomatic correspondents Viktor Runov and Andrey Surzhansky]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Visiting German Justice Minister Klaus Kinkel has held talks on the extradition of former East German leader Erich Honecker with his Soviet and Russian counterparts and found their support on the issue, Kinkel told a news conference here today.

But while stressing that "there were no objections to the arguments presented by the German side", he noted that "a final reply and consent to Honecker's extradition have yet to come".

Commenting on the legal aspects of Honecker's stay in the Soviet Union, Kinkel said that German justice agencies want the former East German leader to face trial in Germany and that proceedings will be fair.

He added that the Soviet side has taken Honecker out of Germany and into the USSR illegally.

Asked about the possibility of German economic sanctions against the Soviet Union if it refuses to extradite Honecker, Kinkel flatly rejected the possibility of such a reaction on the part of German authorities.

He said he did not express a wish to visit Honecker himself, but added that the German ambassador's earlier request for a meeting with the former East German leader was denied.

Troop Withdrawal From Germany Unsatisfactory

LD2310001591 Hamburg DPA in German 1933 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Soviet Union is dissatisfied with the results so far in the attempt to auction off the assets of their Armed Forces still stationed in Germany. The construction of apartments for Soviet soldiers returning from Germany is also not yet satisfactory for Moscow. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Bonn announced this this evening after a session of the joint

commission for the return of Soviet troops was held in Berlin. This could "have negative repercussions on the well-ordered withdrawal of Soviet troops," Moscow's representative on the commission said.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs also said the German side had referred to the fact that the liquidation of "fixed assets" was being carried out under market conditions and was only possible if the Soviet Union accepted appropriate prices. With respect to housing construction, the German side has completely fulfilled its commitments. In addition, there is no legal connection here with the withdrawal.

The commission agreed that up to now the withdrawal was on schedule. So far, 140,000 army personnel have returned. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs also announced that the Soviet side had reported to the commission "the complete withdrawal of Soviet nuclear ammunition." Moscow's representatives also expressed their concern at the "increase in illegal acts" against Soviet military personnel and their families.

Military Food in Germany To Be Shipped Back

PM2310081191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1300 GMT 20 Oct 91

["Television News Service" newscast]

[Text] According to certain reports, we'll be receiving not only German food from Germany but our own produce as well. A decision has been made to transfer to the Soviet Union and sell through the military trading system goods from Soviet military depots in Germany. These contain large amounts of food that had previously been kept in store as a strategic stockpile for our units.

British Embassy Driver Confesses as Spy

LD2310013291 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0009 GMT 23 Oct 91

[By Roger Williams]

[Text] A British Embassy chauffeur who has driven the Rolls-Royce for seven ambassadors in Moscow has confessed to being a KGB agent, according to a report today. Konstantin Demakhin, 51, says the "glasnost" fostered by President Gorbachev decided him to admit that for nearly 20 years he made reports on the conversations of ambassadors.

The INDEPENDENT newspaper quotes Mr. Demakhin as saying: "I didn't do anything bad, but we were blind. I don't believe that the KGB should exist any more." He said he was recruited by the KGB when he was 18. Now he was unhappy for his wife and two sons, aged 22 and 19. Mr. Demakhin—whose story is published today in the liberal Moscow weekly, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA—is waiting to find out if he will be sacked from the job he has held since 1972. The present ambassador, Sir Rodric Braithwaite, wants to speak to Mr. Demakhin before taking any action, according to the INDEPENDENT.

Pardoned Soviet Denies 'Spying' in Italy

LD2210201991 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Larisa Kislinskaya]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—An employee of the Soviet Ministry of External Economic Relations, convicted of "industrial espionage" in Italy and pardoned a year later by President Francesco Cossiga, returned to Moscow. He described the trial and charges against him as "groundless".

Viktor Dmitriyev was arrested by Italian police last summer, while on a business trip as an interpreter and entrepreneur, accused of "industrial espionage" and sentenced to five years in jail.

All negotiations on his release were conducted unofficially and the Soviet Foreign Ministry never even sent a formal protest note, he told TASS.

"I regard the charge of 'attempting to buy secret documents from Olivetti' as groundless and the trial as unconvincing, as no proof of my guilt ever came up," Dmitriyev said.

"I was not even a Communist Party member, but in Italy they still portrayed me as an agent of secret services in the rank of a colonel," he added.

"When my lawyer told my wife I would have to spend at least 30 years behind bars, she turned grey overnight. There are no words that can describe my love and gratitude to her. She stirred up the public in the country, fighting for my sake till the end."

CPSU Aid to Finnish Party Confirmed

LD2210171391 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Surikov]

[Text] Helsinki October 22 TASS—Prominent Finnish politician Aarne Saarinen who headed the Finnish Communist Party in 1966-1982 confirmed today that Finnish Communists had been supplied in the past with funds by the USSR and other socialist countries.

"I do not deny that when I was party chairman, the party received international material support, although I was not virtually involved in the party financial affairs", Saarinen, 77, said in an interview with the newspaper ILTALEHTI.

He said it was an "international fund for aid and was financed by other parties of socialist countries in addition to the CPSU".

Saarinen said that "many other Finnish parties above all their leaders, also used 'friendship' with the CPSU in various forms".

The veteran of the Finnish Communist Party justified financial aid to communists by the USSR by a "tradition of decades". He said economic aid by the USSR did not have a decisive influence on the ideological and political line conducted by the reformist majority in the Finnish Communist Party. "I do not regard this amoral since this did not involve high treason", he said.

Latin American & Caribbean

Committee for Cuban Rights Established

OW2210182991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1513 GMT 22 Oct 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A committee for defending human rights in Cuba, chaired by writer Yuriy Karyakin, has been set up in the Soviet Union. This news was revealed today (October 22) in Moscow, at a press conference highlighting the visit of Carlos Alberto Montaner who is the leader of moderate opposition in Cuba. A statement of the Soviet public, read out during the press conference, urges Fidel Castro to start a dialogue with Cuba's independent public organizations and, "on the basis of civilized norms, to seek ways of leading the country out of the crisis."

Among those who have signed the statement are Yuriy Karyakin, philosopher Leonid Batkin, writer Aleksander Kabakov, playwright Aleksander Gelman, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Aleksander Yablokov, Rector of the Russian State University of the Humanities, Yuriy Afanasyev, philosopher Igor Klyamkin, film- director Elem Klimov, writer Ales Adamovich and Deputy Nikolay Travkin.

Addressing the journalists, president of the Cuban Liberal Union, Carlos Alberto Montaner, said that the purpose of his visit to the USSR was to inform the Russian Federation's leaders of the complicated and critical situation the Castro regime has found itself in, and to create conditions for its transformation.

Only free and democratic elections can pave a bloodless way out of the crisis, he said. But, because Castro is "incapable of making any changes", which can be judged from the results of the recent 4th congress of the Cuban Communist Party, events may take a different turn, whereby the regime may unleash a campaign of violence, he said.

A guest of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia, Mr. Montaner has had several meetings with the Russian Federation's leaders and MPs [members of parliament], and also with the Soviet President's advisers.

Clearly referring to the leader of the Cuban-American Foundation, Jorge Maz Canoza, who also visited the Soviet Union and who represented the conservative wing of the Cuban opposition, Mr. Montaner gave to understand that the Russian Democrats showed more understanding because "they shared the same ideals."

Political & Social

Further Comments on Economic Treaty Signing

Gorbachev Sure Others To Join

OW1810211491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2028 GMT 18 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After signing the economic agreement, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev stated that a political treaty would follow in the near future. "At least," said President Gorbachev in an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent, "long before the end of the year."

He expressed the conviction that many republics, maybe even all of them, would join the economic agreement. In President Gorbachev's words, the President of Georgia, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, called on Friday [18 October] and informed Gorbachev that the Supreme Soviet of Georgia was discussing the economic agreement. Gamsakhurdia asked that it not be signed without his agreement.

President Gorbachev also received a telegram from the Moldovan President Mircha Snegur, which supported the agreement. It was emphasized in the telegram that Moldova will enter into the agreement.

President Gorbachev said that he received news from the Azerbaijani president yesterday, in which Ayaz Mutalibov spoke of his illness. In President Gorbachev's words, Mutalibov spoke in favor of signing the treaty.

President Gorbachev remarked that the text of the economic agreement remained almost entirely unchanged from the form which was made public, "there are practically no changes."

At a press conference after the signing of the economic agreement, President Gorbachev said that the West would now have a better idea with whom it was cooperating: "the State Council and the Inter-Republican Economic Committee are now at the center of state power."

Russian President Boris Yeltsin remarked in his turn that the West would "discuss macroeconomic questions with the center, and concrete economic programs with the sovereign republics."

Boris Yeltsin, having expressed relief at the achievement, warned however against unnecessary euphoria. "We especially need such an agreement now," he said, " when we have long and very very difficult winter months ahead of us. We will be forced to take very unpopular measures." Yeltsin also pointed out that there are still 18-20 agreements to be signed, which will become the real basis of the treaty. He touched on the financial, economic and agrarian aspects of realizing the treaty.

Yeltsin was asked how relationships will be conducted with those republics which did not sign the treaty. In answer, the Russian president expressed hope that they would become associate members of the fellowship, or that they would receive observers' status, which was also provided for in the treaty. "With those who do not wish to join the fellowship under such conditions, we will build relationships through bilateral treaties." Yeltsin stated that just such a treaty for 1992 would be signed by Russia and the Ukraine in the next 10-15 days.

The deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, Ivan Plyushch, stated that Kiev would certainly be in favor of signing the economic agreement. There is only one reason why the Ukraine did not sign the agreement today: it is felt that it can only be signed once bilateral agreements with all the other republics are signed, the Ukrainian representative emphasized. In his words, after this has happenned, the Ukraine will be ready immediately to enter into the inter-republican treaty, of this there is no doubt.

At the press conference, the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, emphasized that if contradictions between republican laws and treaty agreements arose, that the laws of the treaty would be superior.

On Friday the Treaty on Economic Cooperation was signed in Moscow by the Soviet president, and also by the leaders of Russia, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Belorussia, Turkmenia, Tajikistan, and Armenia.

Leaders Appeal to Ukraine

LD2210114191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1040 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—"Only together can our peoples resolve the vital problems of their development and build a worthy future for themselves and their descendants." This is contained in the joint appeal circulated here today and adopted by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the presidents of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenia—namely Boris Yeltsin, Nursultan Nazarbayev, Islam Karimov, Ayaz Mutalibov, Askar Akayev, and Saparmurad Niyazov, and by Stanislav Shushkevich, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Belarus, and Akbarsho Iskandarov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine.

The appeal, the document notes, has been dictated by the desire to bring the country out of the serious economic and political crisis as soon as possible and to return peoples' lives to normal.

The changes which have taken place in the country since the August events have created a fundamentally new political situation. Obstacles to the cardinal democratic renewal of society are being removed, the appeal stresses.

"The Ukraine is a major republic of the Union. Its role in the development of our country, in everything in which our peoples can rightly take pride is irreplaceable.

To be frank, we do not imagine the Union without the Ukraine" the document says.

Opens 'Door to Normal Life'

PM2210141791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 91 p 1

["Commentary for the Edition" by Gennadiy Yastrebtsov: "The Economic Treaty Opens the Door to Normal Life"]

[Text] The leaders of eight sovereign republics signed the Treaty on Economic Cooperation yesterday in the Kremlin's St. George's Hall. The treaty aims to create a common foundation for all republics to cooperate in extricating the country from the crisis. The following put their signatures to the historic document:

President Levon Ter-Petrosyan of Armenia; Stanislav Shushkevich, chairman of the Belarus Supreme Soviet; President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan; President Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan; President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; Akbarsho Iskandarov, deputy chairman of the Tajik Supreme Soviet; President Saparmurad Niyazov of Turkmenia; and President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan. USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev put his signature to the treaty.

In the time preceding the signing of the economic agreement, the date of which had been postponed from 15 to 18 October, USSR President M. Gorbachev had an important meeting with Russian President B. Yeltsin and I. Silayev, chairman of the Interrepublic Economic Committee. They discussed the impending signing of the document and certain amendments.

The day before in Kiev the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium had decided that no agreement would be signed until all that republic's proposals had been analyzed and taken into consideration. L. Kravchuk said so right out at a meeting with Kiev's trade union aktiv.

"The economic agreement is scheduled to be signed tomorrow," he said, "and I have not clapped eyes on it. Someone may say that the Ukraine is arrogant in refusing to sign it blind, but that is what we have decided..."

"The Georgian delegation will not go to Moscow to sign the economic agreement even as observers," G. Taktakishvili, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet standing commission for economic reform, said.

I do not know what lofty considerations guided the representatives of the above republics. I think that, notwithstanding all its shortcomings and omissions, which PRAVDA has already mentioned, even in its present incomplete form the treaty really opens the door for all of us to a normal life.

"I am going to Moscow with the intention of signing the treaty," S. Shushkevich, chairman of the Belarus legislature, told journalists. "We need it. This document does not contain a single line violating the republics' interests."

Moldovan Economy Minister K. Tampiza hews to the same viewpoint. The treaty does not threaten Moldova's sovereignty or independence, the minister stressed.

So the heads of the independent republics met in Moscow signed a very important document yesterday, 18 October.

The representatives of the eight republics shook one another's hands. And President M. Gorbachev said that he saw this as evidence that sentiments are strong in society in favor of living together and making joint efforts to pull out of the crisis.

Republics Discuss Debts, Foreign Relations

Agreement on Foreign Debt

OW2210201891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1648 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Representatives of the republics that have signed the Treaty of Economic Union began in Moscow on Tuesday [22 October] to discuss an agreement on foreign debt.

Economist Yevgeniy Yasin, the future agreement's coordinator, expects the talks to be "very difficult." He said in an interview for IF [INTERFAX] that the republics should discuss 3-5 versions of the draft agreement.

Russia has suggested that each republic pay its own hard currency quota as part of the sum to be paid off to foreign creditors (instead of transferring 40% of its export proceeds to the national budget as is done today.) Mr. Yasin maintains, however, that this opition is not entirely satisfactory since some republics may be unable to raise as much hard currency as is required by the quota. On the other hand, he expects any version of the agreement to be "rather unpleasant for the republics." Mr. Yasin predicted that it might take about a month to prepare the foreign debt agreement, and that debate over taxes and the budget might give rise to a major dispute.

At the same time, the republics could easily conclude a banking system agreement which Yasin views as a "key problem" for the economic community. The economist said the central republican banks had already understood that struggling with each other would make no sense, and had prepared a number of commonly acceptable suggestions, the main one concerning future relationships between the USSR State Bank and the Central Bank of Russia.

Y. Yasin denied the rumor that the USSR State Bank would be liquidated; he said it would actively form the

future banking union's ruling board together with the central republican banks and would continue operating until its legal successor was officially named to the Soviet Union's creditors.

Soviet-U.S. Relations

OW2210132491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1115 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Foreign Ministry officials from eleven ex-Soviet republics (Azerbaijan's representative is absent) opened a conference in Moscow on Tuesday [22 October] to discuss Soviet-American relations and ways of getting action on the Bush-Gorbachev initiatives concerning nuclear disarmament.

Union Foreign Ministry 'Coordinator'

OW2210182191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1513 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Yeltsin's recent statement to the effect that beginning January 1 Russia will finance only three Union ministries—those of defence, communications and nuclear power engineering—has once again raised what seemed long-settled question about the future of the Union ministry. In accordance with the resolution of the Council of Foreign Ministers (CFM) of the sovereign republics, adopted in September, the Foreign Ministry of the Union will perform the functions of a coordinator and work on such cardinal problems as nuclear disarmament. Does Boris Yeltsin's statement mean that the days of the Union Foreign Ministry are counted? DP [Diplomatic Panorama] put this question to Yuriy Kuplyakov who heads the USSR Foreign Ministry's Department for the Union Republics which is to perform the functions of the CFM's Executive Secretariat.

He said that before commenting [on] Boris Yeltsin's statement one has to read it through, and reminded that by decision of the extraordinary 6th Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, four political aspects, including foreign policy, was reserved for the centre.

At all appearances, the sovereign republics do not intend to doubt this decision. On October 22, said Mr. Kuplyakov, a conference involving foreign ministry representatives of 11 sovereign republics opened in Moscow (only Azerbaijan's representative was absent). The foreign ministers are discussing the entire spectrum of Soviet-American relations and also measures to implement the Soviet-American initiative in nuclear disarmament.

On October 27 and 28 Moscow is expected to host a meeting between the republics' economic leaders and representatives of the Group of Seven. On November 5, the CFM will gather again.

"Well, time will put everything in its place," said Mr. Kuplyakov. He also expressed hope that the current transitional period would end and the centrifugal tendencies will be supplanted by centripetal ones. "Together it is much easier to survive than to starve to death on one's own," he said in conclusion.

State Security Organs Reorganization Outlined

KGB Officially Abolished

LD2210205391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1932 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—As was announced officially here, the USSR State Council took the following decision today:

1. It is deemed necessary to abolish the USSR State Security Committee. The state security committees of the republics and the organs subordinated to them are to be regarded as being under the exclusive jurisdiction of the sovereign states.

2. On the basis of the USSR State Security Committee, with the rights of central organs of state administration of the USSR, there are to be created:
—the USSR central intelligence service—for intelligence work with a view to ensuring the security of the republics and the Union as a whole;
—the interrepublican security service—for coordinating the work of the republican security services and conducting counterespionage activity agreed with them;
—and the committee for guarding the USSR state border with a unified border troops command—for organizing the guarding of the state border on land, at sea, in rivers, lakes, and other water bodies, and also of the USSR's economic zone.

It is to be stipulated that the financing and provisioning of supplies and equipment for the abovementioned organs will be from Union budget funds and resources.

3. It is to be regarded expedient to suspend the operation of the 16 May 1991 law "about the state security organs in the USSR" as a whole and to recommend to the USSR president that proposals regarding the temporary operation of individual clauses of this law and draft legislative acts regarding the regulation of the activity of the USSR intelligence service, the interrepublican security service, and of the committee for guarding the USSR state border with a unified border troops command be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Bakatin, Stepashin on Future

PM2210115091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 6-13 Oct 91 p 9

[Report on interview with KGB chief Vadim Bakatin and Sergey Stepashin, chairman of the state commission set up to investigate KGB activities during the coup attempt, by Yevgeniya Albats: "'The KGB Will Exist for Some Time'"]

[Text] It is safe to say that the period of reforming the State Security Committee of the USSR by revolutionary methods is over—for the present stage of our turbulent development anyway. It ended Saturday, September 21, when some of the Committee's staffers were waiting for a decision on the abolition of the KGB, while others, suspecting that the authorities would merely change its name to the KGB of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], were hastily buying badges with Russia's tricolour from co-op vendors. Their expectations did not come true.

It can be presumed that the supreme authorities—those which sit next to one another in the Kremlin—left the stands and pooled their efforts to prevent an upshot in spirit of the East European variant. Boris Yeltsin did that in the belief that whatever was located on Russia's territory would in the final analysis belong to it. For Mikhail Gorbachev... having lost Staraya Ploshchad (the CPSU), the thought of also losing Lubyanka Square (the KGB)—what kind of authority would be left? As a result, in a statement circulated through the channels of news agencies the State Commission announced that the abolition of the KGB of the USSR was out of the question, while the issue at hand was the department's radical reformation and disintegration. The statement says nothing about what central KGB will be like, mirroring the general confusion and the lack of knowledge as to how to break the monstrous KGB while not losing whatever value it has accumulated (dozens of the committee's staff members, especially those from economic counterintelligence, have been leaving for various joint ventures and other kinds of commerce) and, not driving it underground, including into mafia structures.

Vadim Bakatin, chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, maintains that the destiny of its central apparat, totalling about 60,000 officers, depends on what kind of a country the USSR will be and if it will exist at all. The power of the central apparat (the budget of only one of its institution, the Operative-Technical Directorate [OTD] which develops unique instruments is several million dollars) was built by all the republics, and Russia's claims to it, according to Bakatin, may become one more reason for discord among the currently sovereign states.

Incidentally, since we mentioned the OTD, MN [MOSCOW NEWS] inquired twice whether this directorate still runs Laboratory No. 12 which engaged in developing poisons, one of which was used to kill Bulgarian dissident Markov. According to reliable sources, this laboratory still exists, at any rate it did before the putsch, but it dealt not so much with poisons as with different psychotropic agents which could make the Soviet president's "illness" in Foros a fully feasible reality—both for us and for him.

If the Union has nevertheless been kept intact in some form (something for which the KGB chairman still hopes, even though he claims the old USSR is already dead), the centre, in Bakatin's view, will assume the functions of coordinating the activities of the sovereign republics' special services. Incidentally, there will still be a lot of everyday work to do. "We'll deal with Moscow's foreign affairs and visitors, although of course, not as we did before when practically every journalist and tourist was shadowed."

The only thing which is clear today, the chairman says, is that the old KGB will be no more. "It must be divided up both along the vertical and horizontal axis, breaking it up into several independent departments," Vadim Bakatin reaffirmed his previous stand.

Bakatin sees the future committee's basis in the 2nd Main Directorate-counter-intelligence. "This is actually what will be left of the KGB." Its sphere of interests, besides actual counter-intelligence proper, must encompass corruption in the upper echelons of authority, terrorism, drug trafficking, and the state's foreign economic activities. The 2nd Main Directorate will absorb a part of the personnel of the now abolished 3rd Directorate-ideological counterintelligence.

The KGB chairman also confirmed what MN wrote in one of its previous issues. The 1st Main Directorate—intelligence—will become an independent committee, which will service all the citizens of the future Union and take orders from the USSR Supreme Soviet or any other supreme structure enjoying the same rights as the KGB. "Actually even now the 1st MD [Main Directorate] is a state within a state. Moreover, it is just as guilty as the rest of the committee, although this directorate has always been shrouded with an aura of romanticism—agents with illegal status, work abroad," the chairman says. The reason behind Bakhatin's highly critical attitude towards intelligence is not so much the existence in the 1st MD of the notorious Service "A"—disinformation—as the fact that for years intelligence's channels have been used to supply the country's top political leadership with information which in the final analysis drew the country into the arms race. "As a result of this, our security was extremely low," Bakatin believes, "for state security is primarily determined by the country's economy, not by the size of the KGB."

Let me note that, although the 1st MD's branching out as an independent department has been appraised positively by specialists in the main, doubts also exist. The fact is that it is not very clear how intelligence will be able to meet the requirements of so vastly different political regimes as, for example, democratic Russia and the procommunist republics in Central Asia. Not to mention the fact that different regimes can also make different use of the information provided by external intelligence.

Not of least importance is who will head the Soviet counterpart of the CIA. Leonid Shebarshin, who has headed the 1st MD for about three years, no longer holds this post—a few days ago the president of the USSR signed a decree on his resignation. Among the likely

candidates for the post is Yevgeniy Primakov, the USSR President's adviser on international affairs.

And now let's return to the question of the KGB's numerical strength. Vadim Bakatin, as his predecessor, has promised that these figures, like also the figures of the KGB's real budget, will soon be declassified. Although the KGB chairman did not say when journalists would get access to statistics, he implied that there would be fewer security agents than we currently think—something like 120,000-150,000 KGB officers for the whole country. However, when these figures have been further specified, our joy may considerably diminish.

The last question put to the KGB chairman was this: "Don't you fear that the confrontation among KGB members as a result of reductions and reorganizations could intensify, which could have unpredictable consequences for society?" "Yes, I do," was the laconic answer.

Sergey Stepashin, chairman of the state commission set up to investigate the KGB's activities during the putsch and chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet's committee on security, showed similar apprehensions. Despite rumours of conflicts between Bakatin and Stepashin, the viewpoint of the state commission's head largely coincides with that of the KGB chairman.

True, in Stepashin's view, the reforms currently effected in the KGB are rather like a facelift. Judging by his words, the USSR State Security Committee has been the most highly ideologized structure in the system of the country's state administration and hence it is not quite clear how the system can be dismantled while relying on old personnel brought up in the spirit of the totalitarian regime. The committee's ideologized tenor is a source of concern for Bakatin, too. "Whereas in the past the previous KGB chairman was provided with compromising materials on democrats, what lands [on] my desk now is information to the effect that some newspapers avowedly support the CPSU. I am very worried," Bakatin says, "lest the democrats who have emerged victorious today should start settling accounts with their opponents."

...Thus, for the time being there are more questions about what one of the totalitarian regime's most terrible creatures is going to be like than answers to them. "The KGB doesn't have any sense today," said Vadim Bakatin. "Everyone is sitting and waiting to find out how his lot will be decided." According to one staff member of the committee, of a much lower rank than the chairman, he saw for the first time in his 15-year-long service in the KGB people drinking vodka in their offices...

Shevardnadze on Republics, Democratic Movement

PM2210100191 Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Oct 91 pp 1, 2

[Interview with E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the USSR president's Political Consultative Council, by correspondent Andrey Bandenko; place and date not given: "Eduard Shevardnadze: 'The Country's Future Is at Stake'"]

[Text] The forthcoming talks with the Lithuanian Republic, the situation in Georgia, the preparations for the Movement for Democratic Reforms [MDR] congress—these were the topics of TRUD correspondent's conversation with E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the USSR President's Political Consultative Council.

[Bandenko] M.S. Gorbachev has issued a decree appointing you leader of the USSR state delegation for talks with Lithuania. Did this assignment come as a surprise to you, Eduard Amvrosiyevich?

[Shevardnadze] It did not catch me unawares. This question was actually discussed at the Political Consultative Council's first session at the end of September. We had a long discussion, weighing the pros and cons and finalizing details. Gorbachev proposed candidates as leaders of the delegations for talks with the Baltic states. We expressed our opinions. For example, Mikhail Sergeyevich had a different candidate in mind for Latvia, but my firm recommendation was that Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev should head the Soviet Union's delegation. Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak expressed readiness to lead the delegation to Estonia. Consequently we arrived at a joint opinion.

[Bandenko] Have you already formulated your own concept about the future talks, have you mapped out an action plan?

[Shevardnadze] I am pondering this right now. While I was USSR foreign minister, I accumulated a certain amount of experience in talks with heads of foreign states but here, as you can appreciate, the situation is somewhat different. Therefore I am trying not to force events, I am holding consultations and gathering factual material. As regards a concept, it is clear in my mind that it must be underpinned by one main idea: We must conduct the talks process in such a way as to arrive at a new status of relations, as a result of which Lithuania and we would remain friends. After all, matters might develop and the talks might begin in a tone which would not leave us as the best of neighbors. This is how I perceive my task: If we are fated to separate, then let us do it in a nice way. Although I assume that this will not prove easy to achieve in view of the way our mutual relations have developed over the last few years and decades. It is necessary to turn over the page associated with the numerous deformations, mistakes, repressions, and so on. Let me repeat: We must enter the new historical stage as friends.

[Bandenko] Have you already established contacts with the Lithuanian side?

[Shevardnadze] I have always maintained constant contacts with my Lithuanian colleagues. I was pleased to learn of Lithuanian Foreign Minister A. Saudargas' positive response to my appointment as leader of the

delegation. But so far I have had no meetings with the Lithuanian Republic leadership. Let me emphasize once more: I am in no hurry. First of all, I must get everything clear in my own mind.

[Bandenko] But surely you have already set a deadline for beginning the talks?

[Shevardnadze] No, so far there has been no talk of any specific date. Here it is necessary to proceed from expediency and take mutual interests into consideration. It is obvious that the process should not be dragged out. Preparatory work is in progress for the time being. We will try to settle a series of issues such as the question of Soviet troops' stay on Lithuanian territory. This is, after all, a most complex problem and it is necessary to take into account the interests of each and every serviceman, of each and every family. There must be no repetition of the mistakes allowed to occur in East Europe. The mistakes associated with the presence of Soviet Army units there and their withdrawal back home. We must produce a wise decision, there must be no suffering by even a single person regardless of his nationality, whether Lithuania, Russian, Pole, or Belorussian.

[Bandenko] And yet this "divorce" process could stretch over several years?

[Shevardnadze] Individual questions will obviously take longer, but we expect that the basic work will be completed within a few months.

[Bandenko] Who is participating in preparations for the talks on the Soviet side?

[Shevardnadze] The official delegation will include representatives of the Russian Federation (and separate representatives from Kaliningrad Oblast bearing in mind this region's special interest and specific features) and Belorussia, as well as a group of high-ranking military personnel—not just troop leaders but also good politicians. It will also include representatives of various Union structures and other people enjoying prestige and respect in the country. The core of the delegation will comprise 50-60 persons. If necessary we will call upon specialists and consultants. You can appreciate that this is a serious matter and all the finer details must be taken into account. Enough mistakes have been made over the years.

[Bandenko] Has the venue for the talks been set?

[Shevardnadze] No, so far we have not discussed it.

[Bandenko] Can you see the meeting being held on neutral territory?

[Shevardnadze] I personally am not in favor of this. I do not think that our Lithuanian partners would insist on neutral territory. What is the point, if we are in an amicable mood and want peace? A neutral territory would introduce a certain additional overtone, as if to emphasize reciprocal mistrust. After all, we are not embarking on an exercise in reciprocal claims but are seeking compromises and mutually acceptable solutions.

But let us not work on suppositions, let us wait for the talks to begin.

[Bandenko] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, I must ask you something else. Just now I met a delegation of Georgian emissaries in your reception room. I know that you are constantly following events in the republic. How do you appraise what is happening there now?

[Shevardnadze] Georgia is my anguish, and not only because I sympathize with the problems of my relatives living there. It is, after all, my motherland and my roots and destiny are tied with that land. The most terrible things are happening there now. I had great hopes that the conflict between Georgians and Ossetians would somehow be settled, although it is certainly impossible to forget the blood that has been shed. More than 300 persons have died in clashes in South Ossetia—this is terrible. But an even greater drama is being played out now: The Georgian nation itself has split and taken up positions on opposite sides of the barricades.

Those who describe Gamsakhurdia's opponents as a bunch of adventurers and extremists are profoundly mistaken. There probably are some people like that. But the bulk of the opposition comprises students, representatives of the intelligentsia, and figures from science and culture. These are people known all over the country and all over the world. I personally know many of them. These people cannot be ignored. No leader has the right to do so. If a head of state really wishes to build a democratic society, he has to accept the existence of opposition within it. Not a single civilized country would allow such treatment of dissidents. Any further confrontation could have been avoided at the very onset of the conflict, provided there had been respectful attitudes toward one another. What sort of democracy is this, using arms against its own people? Georgians are shedding other Georgians' blood. This is an irremovable stain...

We appreciate that the Georgian democratic state is only just taking shape, mistakes are inevitable along this path, but there are boundaries which must not be crossed.

Nonetheless, I hope that my republic will become a truly democratic country, where the rights of all citizens will be respected regardless of political beliefs and nationality. The tragic present must be overcome.

[Bandenko] Are you not afraid for your own life? Rumor has it that there is a price of 5 million rubles on your head.

[Shevardnadze] I do not think it is enough!.. But seriously speaking, I have lived through many situations when people tried to intimidate or blackmail me. I was not afraid before, why should I be afraid now?

[Bandenko] And a few final questions about your public activity. You head the MDR Organizing Committee

which is preparing the First MDR Congress. This congress is expected to transform the Movement into a political party. Are you not worried that, with the passage of time, it may end up as the "leading and guiding" party?

[Shevardnadze] I do not think this will happen. First, we are not talking about a party yet. This is the opinion of just one group of people who made a statement about the Movement's transformation into a party at the MDR's Moscow conference. But this does not mean that the same opinion will prevail at the congress. At this stage, I personally am more impressed by the Movement as such. I find this form more democratic, more suitable for the transitional period and in line with its specific features. Our main task now is to promote the unification of all democratic and reformist forces in the country, and this is difficult to achieve within a single party's framework. A movement leaves broader scope for maneuver and it can be joined by representatives of different streams advocating one common idea. A party presupposes a rigid structure, statutes, and fixed membership. Furthermore, the following finer point must be borne in mind: Membership of any party is not very popular among people now. We all have learned from bitter experience. A movement does not impose any conditions.

[Bandenko] But let us nonetheless assume that the congress decides to proclaim the MDR as a party, can you see yourself in the general secretary's seat?

[Shevardnadze] No. Let me repeat: It is more than likely that our movement will be preserved and will remain as the main form during the transitional period which, in my opinion, will last 6-10 years. As regards my involvement in the MDR's leadership, I think that now we have arrived at a sound model. We have four rotating cochairmen. Our decisions are made collegially and there are no problems among ourselves.

[Bandenko] Unless I am mistaken, Gorbachev is almost the only communist Left on the Political Consultative Council today. MDR members are in the majority there. Does the president show any interest in your movement's activity?

[Shevardnadze] Not a lot. This may be the most sensible attitude today. At this stage, with so many suspicions stemming from party affiliation, it would be incorrect to show greater attention to any single political force. The most correct attitude today is to maintain some sort of neutrality.

[Bandenko] There is another point I would like to clarify, Eduard Amvrosiyevich. Right after the coup's defeat, Gorbachev offered you a seat on the renewed Security Council. You refused at the time. But a month later you agreed to join the Political Consultative Council. What prompted your change of mind?

[Shevardnadze] At that time, in August, I was not altogether clear about my duties on the Security Council. I found it hard to imagine what specific tasks I would tackle. The Political Consultative Council is a different matter. It has a different status and clearly defined functions and tasks.

But the main point is that the country and the president himself have changed since the coup. I thought to myself that, if Mikhail Sergeyevich has asked me to help at such a complex and critical time for the motherland, I should do everything to be of use—to give hints, to advise, to be consulted, to offer recommendations... When the country's future is at stake, there is no room for personal grievances and ambitions.

These were the thoughts that determined my choice.

Committee Links Ligachev With Coup Plot

AU2210144791 Paris AFP in English 1431 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, Oct 22 (AFP)—A former member of the Communist Party Central Committee Yegor Ligachev was connected to the putschists who attempted to overthrow President Mikhail Gorbachev in August, a Russian parliamentary committee said Tuesday [22 October].

"Some documents prove that if the coup d'etat had succeeded, Ligachev would have been able to have the post of secretary general of the Communist Party Central Committee," in place of Gorbachev, committee member Alexey Surkov said.

Surkov, who presented the committee's report to the Russian parliament, demanded access to the secretary general's archives, in other words those of Gorbachev, to clarify Ligachev's role. He said the putschists had put their most sensitive documents in these confidential archives.

The parliamentary committee was investigating the role of the Soviet and Russian Communist Parties during the mid-August failed coup attempt.

Ligachev was for a long time parliamentary whip of the communist conservatives before he was ousted in July, 1990, at the Communist Party's 28th congress.

Another Putsch Predicted for Late Spring

PM2210132091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 41, 13-20 Oct 91 p 6

[Article by Yevgeniya Albats: "The Next Putsch Will Be Unannounced"]

[Text] Last week brought a sensation: a document entitled "Threat to Security and an Imperative for the Republics to Join Efforts" leaked to the press from the USSR KGB Analytical Department and showed a grim picture of the nation's euphoric present and future—which we have grown accustomed to think of as invariably "bright".

That document was just one in a series of analytical memos prepared for the sake of the current parliament and its successor by experts from the Military-Political Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the USA and Canada, the Europe Institute and heads of two departments in the USSR KGB. Apart from an analysis of the socio-political situation of the nation, there is a list of proposals boiling down to this: "Esteemed democrats, divert your attention from carving up the pie you won through your victory and salvage the country, which is slipping into an abyss of bloodshed and corruption.

The blood-curdling abbreviation "USSR KGB" undersigning the document in fact refers to one person: head of the USSR KGB Analytical Department Vladimir Rubanov, D.Sc. (Economics), one of this country's best analysts. Rubanov was sacked from the KGB when it was headed by Kryuchkov. Rubanov's name featured 38th on the list of people the August putschists first intended to arrest. (Incidentally, the list was discovered in a safe belonging to Valeriy Boldin, former chief of the USSR president's apparat and one of the masterminds and perpetrators of the August putsch.) Funnily enough, two newspapers of polar political orientation—"The independent" and "Rabochiya Tribuna" Workers' Tribune) unanimously regarded the leak of this document as KGB provocation. But this is understandable—the idea of the CIA using its agents to influence Soviet public opinion is more flattering to national pride than a sober analysis of national political and economic impotence.

Fortunately, this analysis saw the light and gave us yet another warning: the August events in Moscow only preceded more ominous events looming large on the horizon.

When?

Most political analysts predict the new coup attempt for late spring. In my opinion it will not have clear-cut boundaries. Instead the "creeping coup" will start in mid- or late January. By that time the country will have assumed a revolutionary situation as defined by Lenin (when the authorities can no longer resolve accumulating political and economic problems and the people can no longer tolerate the aggravating crisis). The situation will ressemble that of summer 1917, when the old managerial structures of the tsar's government were already dismantled but the new structures of the Provisional Government as yet unformed.

In fact the country's managerial structures have been dismantled, with the closing of CPSU committees at all levels. It was a gift for communists, who thus finally evaded responsibility. In time some of them will even be seen as martyrs. But the inertia of the Russian giant still keeps power plants operating and railway trains moving, although fuel reserves will dramatically dwindle by the second month of the coming winter (some of the country's power plants already have as little as 50-80 per cent of the required amount of fuel oil). According to estimates of the USSR KGB Economic Department, Moscow alone will receive 1.5 million kw of electric energy short of what it will require this winter.

Supplies of goods and foodstuffs in the shops will be even more meagre, particularly in Russia's industrial cities. Even today the supply of food to Moscow's shops reaches only 80 per cent of last year's level. The city has potato reserves to last just 10 days. The situation in Leningrad and Sverdlovsk is even worse: the shops have been without flour, meat, milk, or fish for some time. In Sverdlovsk it is even impossible to buy candy, to say nothing of sugar.

Older people will be reminded of the war: people will soon start queuing for bread. The Krasnoyarsk Territory has only one month's worth of flour. There's no margarine or vegetable oil in shops in the Arkhangelsk Region. Cheese and other delicacies are now only remembered from the good old days of communist rule.

Russia will remember its tradition of revolts sparked off by hungry people craving for bread.

This will signify the start of the nation's slide towards a real coup, this time much more serious than the August 1991 comedy. The authorities will try to defuse mounting social tensions by, for example, increasing production of vodka. Therefore the driving force of the revolts will initially have a pronounced "female component", with particular aggressiveness. It is quite likely that the process will quickly, if not immediately, evolve from demos demanding bread to attacks on cooperative shops and the seizure of state supply depots. In some places, especially where the working movement is particularly potent, self-government committees will crop up, mainly concerned with ensuring what they will deem as "just" distribution of food.

The ensuing chaos in Russia will estrange other Republics even more, aggravating their economic problems.

Russia's new authorities which, according to Tsipko, represent a reformist wing of the CPSU have already done enough to discourage the Republics from extending a helping hand to Russia. I have in mind the memorable remark from the speaker of Russia's parliament about the possibility of redrawing the borders, and the mindless carving of the pie: the transition of USSR property to Russia's control.

The winter will also witness a stronger drive towards sovereignty on the part of autonomous state entities incorporated in the Russian Federation. The national principle will act as stimulant. As a result, the situation of Russians residing in these autonomous entities and Union Republics will inevitably worsen. Ultimately, brown-shirt political parties brandishing slogans borrowed from national socialism will make their appearance on the political arena. The regular Army will rise up in support of the Russians. It will be confronted by local national-guard formations. Yeltsin will be either accused

of betraying the interests of Russians, or—if he makes it understood that he will not oppose the "renaissance of Russian awareness"—the role of traitor will be passed to Yeltsin's apparat and he himself will assume the role of tsar.

Who?

It is no longer difficult to define the social basis of support for the coming cataclysm. As we all know, according to an opinion poll carried out on August 20, the Russian authorities were then supported by 52 per cent of Russia's population. Moreover, I am convinced that many of them supported Yeltsin rather than the ideas of freedom and democracy. In this way the impoverished strata of the population, which still have no property to boast about and therefore stand to lose nothing as a result of the coup, will become its mainstay. This force of lumpen mentality will be complemented by an armed force—the Army which has already virtually been abandoned to the mercy of fate in many regions and has to earn its livelihood on its own by sending trucks of soldiers to the potato fields. As estimated by the Military-Political Department of the Institute of US and Canada, the Army is barely controllable even now. The dying centre has been increasingly losing authority whereas the new Russia has not yet learned to issue orders. The republics, whose economic condition is lamentable, are not at all eager to feed the many thousands of armed people who are seen in numerous regions as an occupation army.

Lastly, the military-industrial complex will become a major force in favour of the coup. This is also explicable because they are likewise fighting for the daily bread being snatched from them. Today as many as 11,400,000 persons are employed in the MIC [military-industrial complex] system. The latter consumes the lion's share of output produced in the USSR (e.g., 60 per cent of ferrous metals and the entire output of non-ferrous metals).

Who will be the leaders of the coup? Most likely, the very same second echelon of the KGB-CPSU-MIC oligarchy which did not support the crew of eight—among other things, in view of the obvious unpopularity of the men who formed the Emergency Committee.

Next winter the true leaders of the coup will pursue a policy of provocation, and by the spring, when the Army has been split and ethnic conflicts have grown into civil war, they will emerge on the political forefront.

How?

Here there are two questions. The first—what will it be like?

Civil war will break out in the country. All power will come from the centre. The international community will demand that UN forces be introduced to avert catastrophe at nuclear installations—protection of which, according to estimates by the Military-Political Department of the Institute of U.S. and Canada and the KGB Analytical Department, is already a source of concern today. The military junta will resist this in every way. The world may find itself on the brink of World War III. Refugees from Russia will pour into the cities and villages of Europe incapable of resisting their invasion. This will deprive Western states of the possibility of rendering humanitarian aid to Russia.

The second question—how can we survive? The package of documents contains concrete proposals which essentially boil down to the following: it is time for the victors to take power into their hands. Now in the form of property and capital, but by means of a centralized managerial structure if not capable of halting, then at least arresting, the country's slide towards catastrophe. The republics are being offered a treaty on the establishment of a collective security system.

Let me wind up with an extract from an article by the same Vladimir Rubanov, published by him as early as May 1991 (for which he was evidently entered in Boldin's lists): "As I see it, a dictatorship is associated not with a surprise act by conspirators, but with the inertia of totalitarianism and the marginalization and lumpenization of a population burdened by the heredity of its social consciousness. Its attitude is largely determined not by fundamental economic interests (where can they be found without property?) but by hasty and unstable sentiments. But, as we all know, a tyrant is born of the sway of anarchy. Tormented, harassed, incited by both spontaneous and provoked conflicts, society can itself—without much effort on the part of would-be dictators—demand a 'strong hand'... Freedom is primarily the inner state of the people, not a gift from the powers that be. At the time of the French Revolution it was said that it is not difficult to proclaim a republic—but where do we get the republicans from?"

CPSU Uses State Funds for 'Special Purposes'

924B0052A Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian
No 39, 2-8 Oct 91 p 3

[Article by Aleksandr Yevlakhov: "Hard Currency for Hard Leninists: Secret Fund of the Communist Party's Top Echelons"]

[Text]

Puzzle of the $600,000

Rumors that the CPSU sometimes dipped its hand into the state pocket are somewhat understated.

Only a few days separate the event that served as a jolt to the appearance of this publication from the meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at which Valentin Falin, head of the International Department and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, angrily announced that, in spite of his deputy's immunity, he had been subjected to a search.

Somewhat later it was in this Central Committee department in the presence of witnesses that there was confiscated from the safe... $600,000 in unopened bundles, whose recounting and certification alone took several hours. A team of investigators is now looking into this incident. The ROSSIYA editorial office understands that any attempt to interfere in the investigation process is undesirable.

But something else is clear also: Now, when the question of the CPSU's resources are at the center of public attention and when inventions are springing up around it, standing idly by is impossible also. The question of where so large an amount of foreign currency in the Central Committee department came from is troubling. What is this, the membership dues of communists working overseas? A gift to the Communist Party from overseas benefactors? We already have an answer to this question. Thanks to information in the editorial office's possession on the activity of the CPSU Central Committee concealed from the eyes of "ordinary mortals," quite a full picture is painted.

'To Allocate for Special Purposes'

An employee of the Central Committee International Department once mentioned that the former permanent head of the department, B. Ponomarev (who had until recently even "in retirement," incidentally, occupied an office in Staraya Square) had once unburdened himself. He announced that at the end of the forties he had on an assignment from Stalin taken part in the creation of an "International Fund for Assistance to Worker Organizations of the Left." But he did not specify what kind of fund this was, by whom and with what it was financed, and on what it was spent. And only now is what could only be guessed becoming clear.

We cannot vouch for the fact that all the top secret decisions of the Politburo were kept in the sanctum sanctorum of the Central Committee—the General Department, which has now been opened up. But here are some of those pertaining to later times and concerning our subject.

One of them, dated 4 February 1987 (N P-51/49), reads:

1. To adopt the proposal of the Central Committee International Department concerning the creation of an international fund for assistance to worker organizations of the Left for 1987 in an amount of $20.3 million and to fix the CPSU's contribution at $17.5 million.
2. To instruct the USSR State Bank Board (Comrade V.V. Dementsev) to issue Comrade A.F. Dobrynin with $17.5 million for special purposes.
3. To instruct Comrade A.F. Dobrynin to coordinate with the Communist Party participants in the international fund the size of the fund for 1987 in an amount of $20.3 million and the share contributed by each party."

Documents also confirm the share of each of the former fraternal parties in the "secret" fund, which is in line with the information which was splashed in the press of these countries following the collapse of the communist structures. In 1987 alone this share constituted: $500,000 for the Bulgarian Communist Party, $650,000 for the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, $500,000 for the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and $1.2 million for the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. There is no need to say that, just as in our country also, these sums of foreign currency were taken by no means from party coffers.

To Whom and For What?

The system of distribution of the dollar injections was flexible.

As is clear from a top secret document of 25 February 1987 (N P- 54/18), the communist parties of the United States and France were allocated $2 million each; to Portugal, $1 million; Greece, $900,000; Israel, $600,000; India, $500,000; Argentina, $400,000; and Denmark and Uruguay, $350,000. It can be seen from the documents, incidentally, that in countries where there are several communist parties, the subsidies usually went to those which adhered to the most orthodox positions.

Such decisions were adopted annually. The last of them, dated 11 December (N P-175/3), required Comrade Gerashchenko "to issue to Comrade V.M. Falin for 1990, $22 million for special purposes."

The annual injections to "hard Leninists" were by no means the sole form of their financing, for that matter. There was also so-called supplementary assistance, which was rendered in 1987, for example, to the Communist Party of France [PCF] in the amount of $1 million, and the Communist Party of the United States, $500,000.

I believe that many leaders of overseas communist parties, today's included, should acknowledge that their protestations of love for the CPSU (even given certain disagreements) were far from disinterested.

This was the case with Georges Marchais when he, despite the 1980 boycott of the Olympic Games (over Afghanistan), came to Moscow and embraced L. Brezhnev.

So it was also with other leaders who came to celebrate the 70th anniversary of October: they were "paid" by no means just travel expenses.

It might be objected: What worker organizations of the Left (it was this which was the name of the fund) are we talking about in respect to the Communist Party of the United States, which, together with that of France, received the largest amounts, if it consists, in the main, of paid functionaries and has long since ceased to be followed by any workers?

A reasonable question. But do many workers follow the rest? History long since settled the dispute between the social democrats and the communists, and by no means in favor of the latter.

But closed eyes do not see the truth. The Lenin-Stalin myths concerning the influence of communist ideas on world development got along perfectly well in our country, as can be seen, with the new thinking.

So should the paradoxical situation where one hand—taking—accepted humanitarian assistance from the West in response to our calamitous situation; and the other—giving—fed destructive forces in these same countries, come as any surprise?

There were also, of course, "pleasant" moments for the powers that be when, for example, there appeared in our press G. Hall's interview "A Fish Rots From the Head Down," which was timed to coincide with B. Yeltsin's trip to the United States. Or when that same SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA acquired an opportunity to yet again wash the reader's brains with the journalist Michael Davidow, who is totally unknown in America, but who is a favorite guest of the Leningrad Initiating Congress and who recently appended his signature to a message in defense of the CPSU alongside those of R. Kosolapov, Yu. Slobodkin, and others. It would be difficult for him also to live without the CPSU generously distributing gifts from the public pocket.

Secrets of Technology

But enough of this. Let us go back to the business of the $600,000 that has now been returned to the people. Its solution lies in the true history of the communist movement, which has yet to be written.

When, in 1989, the Polish United Workers Party was on the verge of extinction, its leaders, trying to save the situation, requested of the leaders of the CPSU that they be granted credit. Naturally, it was granted, in an amount of $1.232 million and 500 million zlotys. In October 1990, not long before he assumed the office of vice president, G. Yanayev visited Poland and magnanimously forgave the lion's share of this debt, knocking it down to $600,000.

It is these dollars, most likely, which were in the safe of the CPSU Central Committee International Department. They had probably been delivered by special channels; which, precisely?

The secret of the delivery technology, as also the place where the monies were deposited, come to that, was known to a strictly limited number of persons. Only the head of the department and two other employees were informed as to the existence in the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Relations of deposit N 1, where the money allocated for "special purposes" was kept. Receiving an order from the chief, one of these employees would call the bank from an ordinary municipal telephone and name with the prearranged code the sum required. In a matter a minutes a car would drive up, and, ascending to the department, the "custodian of the monies" would hand the caller the required sum, in cash.

After this, there would be one further call—this time to the Lubyanka, from where would come an employee of the USSR KGB First Chief Directorate (some of the decisions of the Politburo, of 3 July 1987 specifically, which deals with additional assistance to the PCF, also contain in one point the special entry: "To entrust the handing over of the monies to the USSR KGB").

The money would pass via KGB channels to the addressees, whose acknowledgment of receipt would return by the same route to Staraya Square and come to rest in safes of the General Department. The last such receipts are dated the end of 1990. Even when the country's economy was on the verge of perdition, the "feeding" mechanism launched decades ago continued to operate.

Who Will Help the Betrayed Marxists Now?

With the departure of the CPSU from the political arena many communist parties will, most likely, find themselves in a difficult position. After all, the numbers of their supporters have in the last two years alone declined, according to figures of the Hoover Institution for War, Revolution and Peace, by approximately 10 million as it is. The forecast made by Z. Brzezinski, according to whom communism will be remembered by people as a most extraordinary political and intellectual delusion by the start of the next century, is coming true.

Nonetheless, there is perfectly serious reason to believe that attempts are being made to fill the niche in the so-called communist movement previously occupied by the CPSU.

It is perfectly understandable that only the party which still has a monopoly of state power and, like the CPSU, is in reality no sort of party at all, can do this. A number of experts believes that the Communist Party of China is attempting to assume this role.

There is another hypothesis also: the remnants of communist forces outside our country will attempt (materially also) to promote the revival in Russia of a party of the Marxist-Leninist type.

As far as the feudal-communist bastions on the territory of the former USSR are concerned, all the more so. The lumpenization of our society is making these assertions far from groundless. The communist regimes which continue in power will do everything possible to ensure that the processes which have occurred in East Europe and in our country do not roll down to them.

From the editors:

For perfectly understandable reasons we have not deemed it possible to give the names of a number of the persons mentioned in the publication and of those who made available to us the requisite documents making it possible to shortly continue the discussion of secrets which even recently were so zealously guarded.

We thank former employees of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and specialists of other offices for their expert evaluations.

It remains merely to be regretted that the statement sent to PRAVDA on 21 August of this year by a group of employees of this department, which condemns the statement of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, "testifying to political impotence," was ignored by the editorial office.

Alekseyev's Powers Reinstated by Decree

LD2210181191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1730 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] We have received a decree by the USSR president. It says: Taking into account the results of the second extraordinary congress of the All-Union Council of Servicemen's Parents, which discussed on a democratic basis the issue of the head of the committee on affairs of servicemen and members of their families, I decree, to recognize as invalid the 5 October decree of the USSR president on the chairman of the committee on affairs of servicemen and members of their families—the USSR Supreme Soviet Register, 1991 , Number 41—in the part concerning the suspension of the powers of Anatoliy Alekseyevich Alekseyev.

Gorbachev on Land Reform, Price Parity

PM2210203391 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 23 Oct 91 p 2

["Extracts," compiled by M. Silvanovich, from stenographic record of "early October" meeting between President M.S. Gorbachev and rural entrepreneurs: "The Rural Economy: Many Structures—Many Ways"]

[Excerpts] What President M.S. Gorbachev said at the beginning of the meeting was quite clear: For a rural inhabitant, fall is a season when everything that has been done throughout the year is summed up, mistakes and failures can be seen more clearly, and on this basis, an outline of work and achievements for the following year can be mapped out.

Not everything is going well for us as regards food, but we are faced with the task of preserving at least the present level in the provision of staple food products to the people. Land reform is faltering, but it is important to protect this process from new outbursts of voluntarism. It is time to think, seek advice, and plan ways of transforming and modernizing the agrarian sector of our economy. We need to establish our position in the fall, the president said, in order to be able to leave all ambiguity behind us during the fall, winter, and early spring, conclude discussions, and embark on a solid phase of fruitful practical work.

Private farmers, leaseholders, organizers of peasant farms, and leaders of associations, public [narodnyye] enterprises, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes were invited to the meeting, that is, representatives of all the strata of the mixed rural economy—although the mixed system is still in a state of creative chaos, to put it mildly. Over 20 people spoke. [passage omitted]

During the concluding part of the meeting M.S. Gorbachev stressed that the agrarian economy is the most sensitive part of the whole state organism, and all future policy concerning the countryside should be structured with this in mind. All possible acceleration and development of land reform is needed. The land and man, man and the land—here is the basic core of the problems. Supporting proposals made by participants in the meeting on the creation of an orderly system of running the reform of land arrangements, the president cited the experience of Russia, which has formed a state committee for land reform as a structure that runs from the top down to the grassroots, and he proposed that strong social groups capable of enlivening the activity of these organs be organized under their authority.

We need to reform kolkhozes and sovkhozes properly. They are genuinely capable of becoming the cradle of private farmers' and peasants' movements, and most importantly—the basis of technical progress, the servicing of agriculture, and the acceptance and processing of output.

It was stressed that society has finally reached the point of being able to elaborate a clear position as regards land ownership, and the concept of private ownership does not seem so sacred as it appeared even very recently. The time has come to give considerable impetus to agribusiness and encourage entrepreneurs from the industrial sphere of the economy to become interested in building in the countryside and developing the service system.

The question of the parity of prices for industrial and food goods and agricultural raw materials is not new, but it needs to be resolved once and for all. However, it can be resolved in many respects by the development of the market. But the state order and the tax in kind on vitally important goods in the agrarian sector are an obstacle on the path to the market for the peasants. This question has reached the point of maximum tension. The president's conclusion is that this must also be resolved urgently.

An action group took shape during the meeting, which took upon itself the task of drawing up proposals on all the questions broached, and M.S. Gorbachev agreed to submit them for discussion at the State Council.

The following also spoke at the meeting: F.P. Fabrichnov, a private farmer from Moscow Oblast; N.A. Popov, general director of the Association of Russian Peasant Farms and Agricultural Cooperatives [AKKOR]; M.T. Taymazov, a sovkhoz director from Dagestan; F.V. Vershinin, vice president of the AKKOR; V.F. Lishchenko, head of department at the United States and Canada Institute; A.G. Dankbert, president of the "Agroplemsoyuz" joint stock company; A.A. Nikonov,

president of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences; and E.A. Kalinin, first deputy minister of Automobile and Agricultural Machine Building.

War, Labor Veterans' Aims Registered

PM2210155991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Oct 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by Colonel F. Semyanovskiy under "Direct Line" rubric: "Statutes Registered"]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Justice has issued a license for the registration of the All-Union Organization of War and Labor Veterans statutes. The organization is registered as a public association. The statutes define the aims of the organization's activity—elaborating and realizing measures for the rational use of veterans' experience and knowledge; defending their social, economic, and labor interests, their rights and freedoms; showing concern for improving their material position; cooperating with the younger generation; and participating in the movement for peace and disarmament.

TASS Carries Press Reviews

21 October

LD2210093291 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 22 Oct 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Today's press highlights the first session of a newly-elected USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament). The session that opened here on Monday [21 October] is being attended by parliamentarians from seven republics—the Russian Federation, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenia.

It is essential to take the country out of the crisis through joint efforts, President Mikhail Gorbachev told the session. His remarks are being widely quoted in today's newspapers. "Our goals must be a socially-oriented market economy, economic and political freedom, a civic society and a law-governed state," he said.

The Soviet leader touched upon the most topical present-day problems—matters concerning statehood, economics, social peace in society, the cultural and intellectual sphere, the country's security, law enforcement agencies, inter-ethnic relations, and foreign policy.

The press continues to discuss the Economic Union Treaty, which has been signed by the leaders of eight republics and the president of the USSR, and carries political figures', economists' and journalists' comments that convey varied evaluations.

"We have been turned into the Union's raw materials provider" is how Azerbaijan's Prime Minister Gasan Gasanov expresses his attitude to the economic agreement in an interview with NEZAVISEMAYA GAZETA (Independent Gazette).

"Azerbaijan rejects an attempt by the central leadership to make it incumbent upon our republic to repay part of the all-Union foreign debt on a basis that is equal for all," he stated, arguing that "until recently the republic was the Union's major supplier of oil" and that "90 per cent of oil products was taken from it". Nevertheless he admits republics' "integrated relationships and their dependence on one another" and confirms the unwillingness to break off all links with them abruptly.

The Independent Gazette conveys an opinion about the agreement by Givi Taktakishvili, chairman of the Georgian parliament's Standing Commission on Economics, who believes that "an additional liberalisation of the treaty is necessary so that the signatory parties would have the right to stipulate a period of time for which they conclude such an agreement".

For his part, economist Roman Gotsiridze, member of the Democratic Centre Parliamentary Opposition Group, is convinced that the main flaw of the treaty is its "political character".

"The preamble speaks of free sovereign states, but neither Georgia, the Ukraine, nor other republics have been recognised as such by Moscow," he said, expressing the conviction that "veiled forms of political diktat" are inherent in the agreement pattern.

"Still a real family unites round a strong leader that is tolerable to the others," TRUD writes on this subject. The newspaper emphasises Russia's potential possibility to fill the so far vacant "place of a leader".

Eduard Shevardnadze, a prominent Soviet politician, said that his appointment to lead a USSR state delegation for talks with Lithuania was no news to him. Touching upon the concept of the forthcoming talks, Shevardnadze told the newspaper TRUD that he does not try "to speed up developments, is holding consultations and is gathering factual material".

His interview dealt not only with the talks but also with preparations for a congress of the Democratic Reforms Movement. "The main task now is to promote the unification of all democratic and reformist forces in the country", he pointed out.

"The suspension of Communist Party activities has markedly increased the influence of pro-communist groups in the Russian Federation parliament rather than weaken it, "Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the committee on legislation and state adviser of the Russian Federation, told KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. He said he regards this as one of the main causes of a stiffening antagonism between the president and the Russian parliament.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries an interview with Colonel Vladimir Lopatin, deputy chairman of

Russia's state committee on defence affairs. "It is essential to urgently carry out an expert examination of military-industry programmes with a view to standardising them and reducing them by half. The budget structure should be brought into line with world standards. Two-thirds should be earmarked for the maintenance of personnel and the remaining sum should be assigned for weapons", Lopatin said.

The Independent Gazette writes about the possibility of the formation of a new Russian government soon. The newspaper believes that "the economic experts; team that worked out the plan for economic stabilisation in Russia should become the core of a 'reform-minded cabinet'".

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries a signed article on the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident. The author of the article suggests that the contaminated territories of Belorussia be declared free economic zones, that people and enterprises be exempt from taxes, that people be allowed to engage in free trade, start up businesses, receive and spend foreign currency.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries an address by people's deputies of the Russian Federation and members of the deputies' group "Rossiya" to Boris Yeltsin and to the Congress of Russia's People's Deputies in a request that urgent measures be taken to protect the rights and interests of Russia's citizens.

The address was prompted by the arrest of Sergey Parfenov, a member of the Russian Federation Interior-Ministry personnel and former officer of the Riga OMON [special purpose military detachment] squad, in Tyumen region by Latvian criminal police.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA continues to run articles concerning the August coup and, in partiuclar, the German DER SPIEGEL magazine's sensational publication of the records of interrogation of the failed coup leaders.

PRAVDA carries an interview with Gerrit Olivier, South Africa's diplomatic representative in Moscow, on the problem of Soviet-South African relations.

In their international news sections, newspapers focus on developments in Yugoslavia, the Middle East, and the forthcoming Madrid meeting, and run reports from the world's flashpoints.

22 Oct

LD2310074391 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 23 Oct 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Hearings, which began in the parliament of Russia on Tuesday [22 October], on the role of the organisational structures of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) and the Communist Party of the Russian Federation in the coup of August 19-21, 1991, are one of the topics highlighted in today's press.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) newspaper writes in a commentary that the hearings "may well develop into a marked phenomenon of our political life which has grown shallow recently due to the people's preoccupation with purely economic problems".

The newspaper expresses hope that "a review of the past has been undertaken not for the sake of a derisive trial but for the sole purpose of preventing a recurrence of the past."

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA (INDEPENDENT GAZETTE), in an account of the parliamentary hearings, notes that Russia's procurator-general qualified Communist Party activities as conspiring for the purpose of seizing power. The minister of justice presented proofs of the CPSU's help to "firms of friends" abroad. The newspaper believes that the parliamentary hearings "may lead to the elaboration of a law that would ascertain an extent of the responsibility of the CPSU Central Committee".

Newspapers report proceedings at the central parliament session, at which on October 22 the Council of Republics and the Council of the Union separately discussed a provisional procedure for their work and for joint meetings.

TRUD and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA run an address by Mikhail Gorbachev, Boris Yeltsin and republican leaders to the Ukrainian parliament, expressing hope that Ukrainian representatives will take an active part in the building of a new Union.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIA, in a commentary on the Economic Union Treaty, expresses the view that "the most complex problems have been predetermined by the fact that the Economic Union Treaty was prepared practically in utter isolation from a draft political treaty on a new Union".

In the same newspaper, Vladimir Isakov, people's deputy of the Russian Federation, analyses the political events of 1991 and, in particular, the proceedings of the third congress of Russia's people's deputies. Isakov believes that the congress "will go down in the history of Russian parliamentarism as an example of political drama unprecedented for its dynamism and the intensity of passions".

Belorussian parliament chief Stanislav Shushkevich, in an interview with the INDEPENDENT GAZETTE, touched upon the future of the Union and on Belorussia's relations with other republics. He said he would sign a new Union treaty with other republics or with Russia alone "if this is a normal treaty".

Under the rubric "Discussions of the Kurils issue", RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper carries an

account of the trip to the Kuril islands by Russia's people's deputies Sergey Baburin and Nikolay Pavlov. As the deputies pointed out "the majority of Kuril inhabitants declared without hesitation for the revival of the islands on their own and for Russia's continued jurisdiction over the islands."

PRAVDA's Tokyo correspondent Igor Latyshev gives some data published in the Japanese press about the Soviet-Japanese talks in Moscow on the four south Kuril islands.

The correspondent believes that the Soviet public, too, should know the data. "it would be better for advocates of yielding to Japan's territorial claims, if such advocates really exist in the central and Russian Ministries of Foreign Affairs and not only in the imagination of the Japanese, to openly inform our public of their views on the issue. It is time all of us realised at once that the times of back-room diplomacy and secret agreements have receded into the past", Latyshev writes.

PRAVDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA and TRUD carry materials about a workers' solidarity meeting scheduled to be held in Moscow today. The capital's trade unions share the demands of the independent trade unions of Russia and uphold their slogans such as "market prices should be matched by market-determined wages", "there should be a clear-cut mechanism for the privatisation of state property and housing", "workers should have jobs, not unemployment benefits".

TRUD writes about discord between two Chelyabinsk coal miners' unions that have at the same time an aim in common: to uphold the interests of working people. The same newspaper carries reminiscences by Aleksey Rybin, Stalin's former guard.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries an interview with Andrey Sharonov, chairman of Russia's state committee for youth policy. "I want to work, not struggle", he stated.

The press reports the state of affairs in the country's flashpoints. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA runs a reportage by its special correspondent from South Ossetia. "This year has seen 90 Ossetian villages burned down to ashes and about 250 Ossets and approximately the same number of Georgians killed. Such is a mournful outcome of the conflict, an end of which is not in sight so far," the correspondent writes.

KGB Chairman Vadim Bakatin arrived at the editorial office of KOMSOMOLSAYAYA PRAVDA in a usual Volga car, without guards and escort. As the newspaper notes, "none of Bakatin's predecessors would not permit such a thing". The newspaper carries an interview in which Bakatin described the reorganisation of the committee and spoke of himself, his friends and his book.

"Politics, Doctrine and Strategy in the Changing World" is the headline under which KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an interview with General of the Army Vladimir Lobov, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff who shared his ideas of a military reform.

Having pointed out that a military reform signifies primarily the elaboration of a military doctrine, Lobov emphasised that in his view a military doctrine in the nuclear age is "first of all, a doctrine which is aimed at preventing war and at peacefully resolving inter-state conflicts and which proceeds from the priority of universal human values.

Ye. Zhurbina, a psychologist at the Moscow labour exchange, expresses in PRAVDA her point of view on the problem of unemployment. She paid attention to the fact that it is people with higher education who, as a rule, apply to the labour exchange most often. Patenting experts, former staff members of managerial structures, and industrial and research institute engineers were the first to lose their jobs.

Military

Reforms, Military Doctrine, Morale Discussed

Kobets Comments

LD2210210891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 22 Oct 91

[by TASS correspondents Roman Zadunayskiy and Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow 22 October (TASS)—"We must not allow a separate army and defense ministry to be created in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, unless we want to destroy everything", said Army General Konstantin Kobets in reply to a question by TASS correspondents. In the general's opinion, the current structures in the Armed Forces can so far be considered to be viable.

Speaking at a meeting with mass media representatives in Moscow today, K. Kobets explained his concept of security system, which, in his view, must be built on three levels: the national, the Soviet European, and the Soviet-Euro-American.

"We believe," he said, "that in the civilized world today there are no enemies or opponents. The Armed Forces are necessary for an adequate response to that degree of danger which each of the participants in the collective security structures or any other country may potentially present. This approach presupposes reconsideration of the currently existing Soviet defense military doctrine and the adoption of a new one which can be symbolically described as a war prevention doctrine."

The general familiarized the journalists with the reform proposals in the country's Armed Forces. The concept for this is being worked out by the committee he is heading. In particular he noted that this concept includes the conclusion of a defense alliance [soyuz] of sovereign states, the setting up of conditions and a framework for inter-republican military and economic cooperation, the

provision of socio-judicial guarantees for all military servicemen, and direct reform in the Armed Forces.

No 'Long-Term' Policy

PM2110152691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[Article by Valeriy Ochirov, first deputy chief of Ground Forces Aviation—first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction: "You Can Privatize Anything Except the Army"]

[Text] The next session of the country's Supreme Soviet is to be devoted to a discussion of the new concept for radical military reform. How are the preparations going, what contribution are the leaders of sovereign republics making, what events are now taking place in the Armed Forces, and what is the morale of the men in uniform?

USSR People's Deputy Valeriy Ochirov, first deputy chief of the Ground Forces Aviation, reflects on this.

[Ochirov] When I think about the situation in the country and the Armed Forces—and I have been in the services for more than 20 years, I fought in Afghanistan, and for more than two years now I have been involved with defense questions as a member of the Supreme Soviet—three most acute problems concern me. They are the practical implementation of the new military reform, the attempt to divide up the Army and its nuclear potential into national compartments, and the morale of my comrades in military service—officers and professionals, without whom the Army cannot get by.

The new military reform concept has been examined in the Defense Ministry collegium twice in the period since the putsch, and these questions have come up time and again at consultative meetings with representatives of the sovereign republics. What is particularly worrying?

The fact that we are beginning as if with a clean sheet, as if we had no accumulated experience, no tried and tested approaches, no traditions of our own. The haste is such that you would think the ground beneath our feet was on fire.

There is no denying it. We are well and truly behind in adopting resolute measures to improve the situation in the Army and bring it up to a modern level of development of military science. And the war in the Persian Gulf and the operations and armaments of the coalition's combat units demonstrated this graphically. But what is happening with the military reform today still looks more like an attempt to put out the fire and paper over the cracks than a long-term state policy.

There are several basic versions of the reform concept, drawn up in the ministry apparatus, in the General Staff, and by USSR and Russian people's deputies. They reveal the basic principles for building the new army: its departyization and depoliticization, the optimization of the structure and numerical strength, the separation of state power functions and purely military functions, the democratization of military service, greater social protection for men in uniform... They also incorporate such priorities as the equal participation of the sovereign republics in the formulation of a common military doctrine and its implementation in practice. All this inspires hope.

But the problem is this. Once again, yesterday's trends are in evidence. A given concept is geared not to long-term plans, but to a current leader, and is adapted to suit his views. There is the desire to separate the General Staff from the Defense Ministry and concentrate all control functions in the General Staff, thereby leaving the minister with nothing but consultative committees and commissions.

Other versions envisage the duplication of various systems and the burgeoning of the administrative apparatus, although it would be replaced by civilian officials. Then comes the call for a resolute reduction, by half or two-thirds, in the army bureaucracy, and not only the bureaucracy...

People who have taken over the leadership of branches of the Armed Forces only recently and have not yet fully come to terms with their new jobs are having to take decisions whose consequences it is hard for them to predict. And once again political motives and politicial ambitions are in the forefront, and science and its long-term predictions are forgotten. It does not enter into the reckoning.

The other day I met with scientists from the Moscow Financial Institute's military faculty and professors from the General Staff Academy and other Defense Ministry scientific institutions. Experts in military economics and doctors and candidates of science, they say with surprise and concern that they are learning about the new military reform concept from the newspapers. Nobody has consulted with them or reckoned up: How much will the new Army cost? What expenditure will be required to reorganize it? How could material and technical supplies be organized? What is its connection with the future political and economic structure of the state? And what state? What is the view of the committee for the formulation and implementation of military reform under the State Council, which was set up by USSR presidential decree?

There are no answers. And the danger is that the reform could become just another campaign and once again discredit itself.

The haste is understandable, of course. The process of sovereignization of Union republics is in progress. In effect, each of them is laying claim to its share of the Armed Forces. The Ukraine and Kazakhstan, which only yesterday were voting for their territory to become a nuclear-free zone, are today, by a decision of the republics' political leadership, banning any redeployment of troops and combat equipment to outside their borders, and that means they are also planning to assert their right to strategic offensive forces and nuclear arsenals.

In the Ukraine, there are increasing attempts to "privatize"—without consultation—three military districts with all their combat infrastructure, as well as the main forces of the Black Sea Fleet. Similar draft laws are in preparation in Azerbaijan, Georgia, Armenia, Moldova...

At the recent consultative meeting at the Defense Ministry the Azerbaijani representative told me that two aviation regiments which are being withdrawn from Germany, which it is planned to station in Salyany and Adzhi-Kabul, will be subordinate to the republic president and will fulfill his instructions. In Krivoy Rog the local authorities have decided to "nationalize," for the benefit of the civilian population, a military camp built by foreign firms for units being withdrawn from the Western Group...

I have nothing against the desire of every sovereign state to have its own Armed Forces in the form of a national guard or other units. I welcome their desire to defend their independence, borders, and territorial integrity. But I can very well imagine how things might turn out when a republic representative presents himself to the commanding officer of, say, a tank regiment and tells him that he is now under his jurisdiction, or when another such "commissar" goes to a combat equipment depot and demands that they carry out his instructions.

Every unit is a protected military facility. An officer is bound by his oath, his understanding of military honor and duty, and legal norms—so does it mean conflict, bloodshed? The Yugoslav scenario? Do we need that?

I think it is time to do away with bolshevik methods and ideology in nationalization and distribution. The Army, and especially its nuclear weapons, cannot be privatized and split up into national compartments—it will be disastrous. We must move toward civilized, law-governed norms in life. The reform of the Armed Forces and unified control of them, with the participation of all the republics, will be much cheaper and safer.

Although—and this must be stressed again—the republics have every right to create their own Armed Forces. But in arming them it must be remembered that our country has signed the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has no right to transfer manufacturing technology or components, and has also signed the 1990 Paris agreement on conventional arms reduction, which stipulates quotas for the siting of means of armed struggle such as tanks, infantry combat vehicles, artillery, helicopters, aircraft... And then there is the START Treaty.

What is to be done here? Who in the republics knows the answer to these questions?

But, in reflecting on all this, we must not forget what are perhaps the most acute, most important problems—those of the morale of the man in uniform. I am not going to go on yet again about the still unresolved problem of those without apartments or the literally beggarly existence of officers at the junior and middle levels. It is also true that the pay of senior officers cannot keep pace with galloping prices and the growth in the cost of living.

That is not the point now. In some garrisons of the Baltic Military District, and not only there, people are already saying openly at officers' meetings that if decisions on the restructuring of the Armed Forces and the redeployment and drastic reduction of military units are adopted without taking account of the man under arms and without social or material backup, they will regard these decisions as inhumane and even criminal, and therefore reserve the moral right not to fulfill them.

Very serious and very worrying words. And difficult as it is to admit it, I am aware that behind these words there could lie the real preconditions for new, highly serious social upheavals in our society.

I am not trying to frighten anyone—in the Army today there are officers who think for themselves, as the three days in August graphically demonstrated—although, in my view, society should have a clear idea of the real picture of the morale of the man under arms and his confidence in his future and his present.

...What is the solution? I am sure there is one. I do not think we should rush through the military reform now, we should, alongside the signing of the economic agreement, also sign a treaty with the sovereign republics on joint defense, on unified Armed Forces and centralized control of nuclear and strategic systems. Those who are unwilling to enter into such a treaty could align themselves with it on various terms and become associate members, and then it would be necessary to conclude an agreement on the status of Soviet troops on their territories or on the procedure and time scale for their withdrawal.

It would then be possible to resolve questions concerning the size of the military budget for the new year, 1992, the quotas for each republic, and the number of troops they could maintain at their own expense, and to review the force composition and siting of all strategic and operational groupings on the basis of the new military-political situation and the economic potential of the Union, the recent initiatives of G. Bush and M. Gorbachev, the further radical reduction of the Army and Navy...

People say this will take more funds. Where are they to come from? In my view we should stop buying arms and military equipment for two or three years, while continuing research and development; realize through the market (commodity exchanges, auctions, commercial military enterprises, and such like) unwanted goods, obsolete equipment, and other material resources; issue loan bonds (republic and union) for the formation of a fund for the protection of discharged officers and warrant officers; obtain loans from foreign states specifically for the purpose of reducing the Armed Forces...

And, most important, formulate and adopt—not merely in words, but in practice—a program for the social protection of officers and warrant officers who are in service or are being discharged to the reserve, making provision for the indexation of their pay and pensions in connection with unrestrained price rises and for the payment of lump sums of 20,000-50,000 rubles depending on the composition of the family and availability of housing...

There are other proposals too. But it seems to me that in implementing the reform of the Armed Forces we must constantly remember that this reform is intended not only to optimize the country's defense, but also to show concern for the man in uniform who serves his people not out of fear, but out of conscience.

No Progress in Chemical Warfare Destruction

PM2310091991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[Text] On 1 June 1990 the presidents of the United States and the USSR signed the agreement on the total destruction of the two countries' chemical weapons. The commitments assumed by our state demand that we get such work under way before 31 December 1992. But to date there is not a single plant in the USSR for the destruction of combat toxins, and construction has not even been started... What are the reasons for this situation?

Colonel General S. Petrov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry's Chemical Troops, answers our correspondent's questions.

"In my view," Stanislav Veniaminovich said, "the main reason is that the agreement signed in Washington almost 18 months ago still does not have juridical force. It has not been ratified by the country's Supreme Soviet and has not even been submitted to it for ratification. Although we drew up a state program for the destruction of chemical weapons together with other ministries and departments on the president's instructions and submitted it to Supreme Soviet commissions and committees and then, after additional work, also to the former Cabinet of Ministers, there is neither the money nor a decision to implement it."

[Litovkin] What sums are needed to implement this program? And for what term is it designed?

[Petrov] With regard to money—just over 5.4 billion rubles [R] at 1991 prices. But as for the term...

There are several options for the destruction of chemical weapons. One of them is to construct terminals for the transfer of mustard gas, lewisite, and their compounds in the areas where they are stored, from large capacities to specially developed technological transport containers which meet all international safety norms.

It is proposed to construct these terminals (without them it is hard to count on the safe processing of lewisite) in Udmurtia, where the main stocks of the substances I have mentioned are held, and in Saratov Oblast. This will take four or five years and R200 million. This will also go on the construction of sociocultural and domestic projects and engineering networks and on the development of the infrastructure in these areas.

With other options—for example, when reequipping or reprofiling chemical enterprises in order to destroy toxins—it will take a year or two after the adoption of such a decision.

We already have everything ready—the state program weighs a total of 35 kg, planning and surveying examinations have been conducted, as has other research and development work, on which almost R100 million has been spent—but everything is still up in the air...

A state commission to choose and agree on the areas for such projects has not yet even been set up, there are no organizational staff structures that will implement the toxin destruction program... In my view, it is inadmissible to endlessly protract the resolution of such problems.

[Litovkin] But the country has many other paramount problems today. The destruction of chemical weapons is far from being the chief among them.

[Petrov] Undoubtedly. But the failure of the agreement signed in Washington casts doubt on our country's readiness to honor its pledges. And not only in respect of chemical weapons. Confidence is easily lost and cannot be restored for any money.

[Litovkin] How do things stand with our partners' destruction of their chemical weapons?

[Petrov] The Americans constructed the first enterprise for the destruction of toxins by the method of direct incineration on Johnson Island in the Pacific. And they have already begun this work, although they have reportedly experienced some problems with safety there.

They are now constructing several installations in the continential part of the country, next to the places where chemical weapons are stored, and will, I believe, fulfill their pledges with regard to their destruction by 1998, just as envisaged. The chief point is that they have adopted national legislation on this question. This enables them to marshal their forces efficiently and to work without fuss or haste, observing all precautions.

Incidentally, the United States pays very great attention to work with the public and the population of those areas where installations for the destruction of toxins are being constructed. It even has, within the structure of the Department of Defense chemical disarmament committee, a special subdepartment which explains to people the full safety of the technological operations in installations for the destruction of such weapons, and eminent scientists are recruited for this purpose, moreover, from scientific establishments in those places where installations for the destruction of toxins are being created.

[Litovkin] The United States has repeatedly offered us assistance in constructing installations for the destruction of toxins on the basis of its own technology... Does it, perhaps, make sense to accept it? This will be less costly.

[Petrov] Unfortunately, not less costly. We have made a comprehensive analysis of these offers and concluded that it will not profit us to realize them. For both economic and technical reasons...

[Litovkin] One other financial question. Practically all stocks of chemical weapons are concentrated on Russian territory. It turns out that Russia alone must pay for their destruction.

[Petrov] In my view, it is unfair to put the question in this way. The stocks of combat toxins were created by the whole country on the basis of its scientific, industrial, and military potential. And the burden of the expenditure on destroying and utilizing them must, of course, be borne proportionally by all the sovereign republics.

[Litovkin] And the final point. The country is switching to new forms of economic management. Why do you not take on independent, nongovernmental organizations as partners in the destruction and utilization of toxins?

[Petrov] We are ready to cooperate with them and are open to any offers, both financial and economic, technical... The only point we must bear in mind is the juridical responsibility borne under international law by state structures for the safety and control of toxins as weapons of mass destruction.

There is enough work for everyone. We are prepared to share it. Provided there is real assistance and real action aimed at fulfilling our obligations.

Baltic Fleet Commander on Troop Withdrawal

PM2110095791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Ranevskiy, Captain Second Rank V. Gromak, and Captain Second Rank V. Urban: "Troops in the Baltic: Will We Withdraw to Previously Prepared Borders?"]

[Excerpt] Despite the fact that the USSR Defense Ministry leadership has already repeatedly stated that the Soviet troops can be withdrawn from the Baltic states only after 1994, passions continue to seethe. The situation has become particularly aggravated in the military collectives since the statement by the Baltic Council that troops should be withdrawn from the capitals of the independent republics by 1 December.

How is the situation taking shape now? What is the forecast?

Commanders' Opinion

A deadline of 1 December has been called unrealistic by Lieutenant General V. Mironov, commander of the Baltic Military District. He also stressed that all questions connected with the withdrawal of the troops should be resolved in the process of interstate talks. But until they have begun we can expect new statements from our "old opponents."

Vice Admiral V. Yegorov, commander of the Baltic Fleet, agrees with this in principle. Here is what he said, in particular, to our correspondent:

"We cannot fail to respect the will of the Baltic states. But it is obvious that we must also consider something else: the interests of our state and the interests of the Armed Forces and the fleet in particular. And we have the right to count on understanding for these interests and for our problems. The fate of the fleet should obviously be decided within the framework of interstate agreements concluded on the basis of the principles of equality, respect for state sovereignty, mutual understanding, and mutual interest in preserving a broad perspective of vital relations.

"So far an agreement has been signed between the USSR Defense Ministry and the Estonian Republic Government on priority measures for the solution of questions connected with the presence of the contingent of USSR Armed Forces on the territory of the Estonian Republic. According to this agreement, by 3 November the deadline and procedure will have been established for the withdrawal of the motorized units, Air Force and air defense units, and military units redeployed from East Europe. It is clear from a statement by Estonian Government press secretary Sergey Chernov that as regards the Naval Forces the schedule will be worked out separately, since they are relatively autonomous compared with the other Armed Forces. The status of the USSR Armed Forces on the territory of the Estonian Republic will also be determined within a month." [passage omitted]

Baltic Affairs

Baltic Leaders Seek U.S. Development Concepts

OW2210205191 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2002 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Thursday [24 October] morning Estonia's Premier Edgar Savisaar is leaving for the United States where his Latvian and Lithuanian counterparts—Ivars Godmanis and Gediminas Vagnorius—are also expected shortly. The Baltic leaders will attend a seminar in Indianopolis on economic development of their area. The Hudson Institute has prepared for them a conception of economic development of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The Hudson Institute has been working about a year at the conception of the Baltic countries' transition to market economy. The final version has been drawn jointly with Baltic experts.

The ceremony of handing over the papers to the Baltic premiers will be attended by the US Vice-President Dan Quayle.

Estonia

Economy Needs 'Outside Help'

PM2210151391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with Estonian Supreme Soviet Chairman Arnold Ruutel by correspondent L. Levitskiy: "After Freedom, What?"]

[Text] [Levitskiy] The goal that the movements and parties that you personally presented three years ago has been attained. What factors contributed to that, do you think?

[Ruutel] The decisive factor was the people's desire for freedom. But our independence was made possible by the democratic transformations in the USSR and, above all, in Russia. The international public's support played an enormous part too. It prevented the escalation of the January events in the Baltic states. It was much in evidence in August too.

During the three years I have had hundreds of meetings all over the world. We have received a vast number of letters and telegrams containing words of support and sympathy. We have had the support of business people, artists, writers, musicians, farmers, journalists, and Estonian emigres. But above all I want to say thank you to some remarkable people in Russia. As you know, the first to recognize Estonian independence was President Boris Yeltsin. We are grateful to Andrey Sakharov, Eduard Shevardnadze, Aleksandr Yakovlev, Vadim Bakatin, Anatoliy Sobchak, Ruslan Khasbulatov, and Aleksiy II, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia.

I must express gratitude to the leaders of many Western countries, above all to George Bush and James Baker. I cannot name everyone, of course—it is physically impossible—but they are now a permanent part of Estonian history.

[Levitskiy] Could you explain: What kind of Estonian republic was it that was born on 20 August? A republic on the 1918 and 1938 model, with its constitution, social system and structure, and relations between people of different nationalities living in Estonia?

[Ruutel] Your question is not entirely accurate. The republic was not born on 20 August. That day saw the revival of a state that had been erased from the world map more than 50 years ago as a result of a deal between two empires—Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union. Naturally, the revival starts from the very moment when the functioning of the state system was interrupted. Of course, the world has moved on a long way since then, so we are bearing that in mind and are intending to join the community of civilized countries as an equal partner. That is why a special body—the Constitutional Assembly—has been instructed to bring the 1938 Estonian Constitution into line with the changes that have taken place in international law. If we are talking about the social system and structure, then let us not resort to the terminology of class struggle. There was a normal market economy in Estonia before 1940. As a result, we even had a better living standard than a number of European countries. For example, Finland, which we are now hopelessly behind after 50 years of a "society of the dictatorship of the proletariat." And relations between people of different nationalities in Estonia were very civilized, ensuring cultural autonomy for ethnic minorities. At any rate, I never heard of any mass emigration by Estonians to the Soviet Union or other countries at that time.

[Levitskiy] Why, in your view, did a seemingly powerful country like the Soviet Union break up? What kind of relations will there be in the future, do you think, between the former union republics and the republics that have stayed in the USSR? Does Estonia have its own initiatives to make?

[Ruutel] The country merely appeared strong, in fact. You cannot attain real might by ignoring or violating the laws of social development. You cannot feed people on stories about a happy tomorrow when there is no bread or extol freedom while covering the country with concentration camps. The so-called socialist option proved to be totally bankrupt, both in the economy and in culture. The experience of the USSR demonstrated once again that not only do empires based on violence not have a bright future, they have no future at all...

I am not going to, indeed I cannot express my opinion on mutual relations between the republics that wished to form a new Union. But I will say that Estonia will seek

normal friendly and good-neighborly relations with the USSR, with its republics, and with states that have become independent. We have no need to put forward any initiatives—this is a position we have expressed repeatedly. We presented a package of proposals to the Soviet delegation at the talks. I informed M.S. Gorbachev of them. I will add that we are already implementing such a program in relations with Russia.

[Levitskiy] According to sociologists' information, one-third of the Russian-speaking population intends to request Estonian citizenship. That leaves 65 percent. What does the future hold for these people? Can they expect equal social, economic, and civil rights?

[Ruutel] I am rather suspicious of the figures you cite. But it is true that many non-Estonians have found it hard to adjust, to accept the changes that have taken place here. But let me repeat: No way are we blaming individuals for the Soviet regime's crimes. The honest working person has nothing to fear. It must be realized at last that the question of citizenship is merely a question of participating in the republic's political life. In no way is it associated with social and property rights and freedoms.

Anyway, I do not understand all the fuss about the citizenship question. In most countries barely one-tenth of the people are actively involved in political life. But these countries live and prosper. As far as I know, none of the draft laws on citizenship—and several alternative drafts are being prepared—says anything about a general limit on the right to acquire citizenship. The point is that in order to participate in political life you need at least to be familiar with the real conditions in Estonia. To know a little more about it than is written in school history books and to know a little of the state language.

Furthermore, I am sure that by no means everyone would want to be an Estonian citizen. Some will take Russian citizenship, some will take that of another republic. But everyone living in Estonia will have the same rights as its citizens, aside from political rights.

[Levitskiy] What does the immediate future hold in terms of Estonia's political development, and, if possible, can you say what your own political plans and aims are?

[Ruutel] The Estonian Republic is an entity in international law and it has become a member of the world community again. As is known, until 1940 Estonia was a member of the League of Nations. Its admission to the United Nations is a massive step toward the actual reestablishment of statehood and one that, at the same time, imposed serious commitments in terms of observance of the UN Charter and UN documents, including those relating to human rights and norms of relations between states. At the same time, we have also acquired an international guarantee of our rights. The immediate tasks are to conduct a whole range of interstate talks with the rightful heirs of the USSR and its former republics. The future of Soviet troops in Estonia has to be decided—we want to be a neutral zone. The division of the financial system has to be decided on, and economic relations have to be regulated.

We have many internal problems too. I regard the strengthening of civil accord between the Estonian and non-Estonian populations as one of the most important of them. This does not rule out the defense of one's own interests. But it does rule out the use of uncivilized methods.

The revival of the Estonian economy, undermined over the past 50 years, poses a very substantial range of questions. Probably we will not be able to get by without outside help on this one. So we would like to join such organizations as the IMF and major international banks.

If we are talking about the strategy for Estonia's political development, there is no alternative, as far as I can see, to the building of a democratic, rule-of-law state. It is a commonplace, but that is our aim. Otherwise, we will lose the support of the world community and the support of our own people.

National Service Bill Discussed

OW2210181091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1548 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Estonian Government held a meeting yesterday at which it discussed a bill on national service prepared by the Ministry of Justice and the government's Defence Commission.

According to the deputy minister of justice, Hart Raski, the main purpose of the new law is to provide a basis for the formation of armed services indispensable to the republic—border and interior troops and a rescue service. The law will introduce conscription and will contain all the provisions necessary to carry it into effect.

According to the bill, all male citizens of Estonia between the ages of 18 and 28 are liable for national service. Future conscripts will be registered at the age of 17. The duration of service will be 18 months, but the term may be reduced to one year for excellent service.

Service may be deferred for breadwinners having two or more children or Group 1 or 2 invalids to support.

Students at military or similar schools (e.g. the police academy) or persons who have served in the Soviet Armed Forces for no less than 18 months will be exempt from national service. Persons who have served prison terms for premeditated offences will have to do labour instead of military service.

There will be alternative labour service for those who cannot do military service for religious or health reasons.

The bill also envisages service on a contract-basis for citizens both of Estonia and any other state.

Authorities Enunciate Citizenship Demands

OW2210185491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1708 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Heads of regional and city councils in Estonia have appealed to the republic's parliament to enact as soon as possible the 1938 law on Estonian citizenship without any amendnents. The appeal has been published today, Oct 22, in the newspaper Rahva Haal. Last week parliament ruled that a bill should be presented within a fortnight restoring the 1938 Law on Citizenship with certain amendments and additions. But the authors of the appeal argue that the Supreme Soviet has no right to change the law of 1938.

The local authorities also propose re-instating Presidency under Estonia's 1938 Constitution, giving the president a right of veto on parliamentary legislation, and powers to appoint and recall a premier and other ministers.

Beside, the appeal is for reviving the right of "popular initiative" which was contained by the Constitution of 1920 replaced later with the 1938 one. The right permits any citizen to call a referendum on his proposal concerning state affairs if he collects a certain number of signatures in its support.

Talks With USSR To Open 10 Nov

OW2210204691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 2002 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Delegations of the USSR and Estonian Foreign Ministries have reached an agreement today, Oct 22, in Moscow, on the approximate date for a meeting of official delegations for talks between the two states—Nov 10. The question of inter-state talks between the USSR and Estonia was brought up for the first time.

According to a BALTFAX correspondent, the date was also discussed at an unofficial confidential meeting in Narva-Joesuu Oct 20 between Estonia's Premier Edgar Savisaar and the leader of the USSR delegation, Mayor of St. Petersburg Anatoliy Sobchak.

Intention To Join IMF, World Bank Noted

OW2210184991 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1548 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The General Director of the Estonian Department for Foreign Economic Relations, Mehis Pilv, who was a member of the Estonian delegation at the annual meeting of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in Bangkok, said at a press conference in Tallinn yesterday that it would probably be decided to admit Estonia to these organisations as a member in the spring of 1992.

According to Mr. Pilv, the Estonian delegation had many important meetings with leaders of various financial organisations. In particular, it discussed its forms of future cooperation with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and reached an agreement with the Swedish Finance Ministry in accordance with which Sweden will pay Estonia's admission fee to EBRD.

Latvia

Godmanis on World Bank-IMF Delegation's Tasks

LD2210195091 Riga Radio Riga International in Latvian 2030 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Excerpt] We offer for your attention a recording from the news conference at which Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis spoke today about the World Bank and International Monetary Fund annual meeting in Bangkok, at which the premiers of all three Baltic republics spoke.

[Begin recording] [Godmanis] Briefly, I'd like to tell you about the situation in which we find ourselves: A process of settling in has begun, in any case, with the pending arrival here of a commission of experts of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. This commission is arriving here in relation to the system which is to be applied, independently of what the country might want to enter into in these institutions. Of course, it will examine the entire economic situation. Basically it is interested in two things. Most of all these bodies are shocked at our external economic balance, so that we are to (?redress) the balance, both in hard currency and in so-called [word indistinct] currency. That is what shocks them most, because, no doubt, inclusion in this financial organization and the relevant credit according to request is very essentially connected with how far we can repay this money. The International Monetary Fund does not assign money, it does not grant money—it only lends it—in the best cases from three to five years at a bank credit rate that is of course lower than on the market, but never a gift, however. The World Bank is a little more unique, (?so) they give their special questions as to how we have got into a very poor position on the world list—and in their figures, at present it is $390 a year [as heard], which is their own conclusion made by a group [word indistinct]. The commission will arrive here at the beginning of November.

We in the government are forming an institution concerned only with the International Monetary Fund-World Bank commission. [passage omitted]

USSR Bank No Longer Responsible for Operations

LD2210210591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" program]

[Text] Following the de facto nationalization, by decision of Latvian bodies of state power, of the branch of the USSR Vneshekonombank located in Latvia, the leadership of the USSR Vneshekonombank announces that, as of 10 October, the bank does not accept any responsibility for operations or deals concluded in Riga. All the rights given earlier to that institution to settle foreign accounts also have been annulled.

Minister Notes Problem Traveling to Republic

LD2310031291 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 0900 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Belgian Foreign Minister Mark Eyskens arrived in Latvia for a visit 21 October. He met Latvian Supreme Council Chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs. The talks concerned the 24 nations' meeting in Brussels due on 11 November, at which a decision on aid to the Baltics is to be made.

On the evening of 21 October, Belgian Foreign Minister Mark Eyskens and Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans held a news conference at Riga airport. Both ministers replied to journalists' questions about the incident where the aircraft from Belgium was not allowed into the airport by the Baltic Military District, with the reason given that it was a military type of aircraft. The Belgian foreign minister had to wait for four hours at Copenhagen airport until permission was given to fly to Riga. In connection with this, the Latvian Foreign Ministry has sent a protest note to the USSR Foreign Ministry demanding an explanation. After that there was talk of possible cooperation between Belgium and Latvia. The same night, the Belgian foreign minister left for home.

Lithuania

Citizenship Decision Deadline Draws Closer

OW2210185591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1548 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In accordance with the 1989 law on citizenship of Lithuania, the term during which persons resident in the republic have to choose their citizenship expires on November 3.

The law guarantees Lithuanian citizenship to persons who had it before 1940, their direct descendants and persons who came to live in Lithuania before November 3, 1989. Those who arrived later need a 10-year naturalisation period to be granted Lithuanian citizenship.

A new bill on citizenship has already been submitted to the Supreme Council of Lithuania which rules out dual citizenship, including for Lithuanians who left Lithuania after the Soviet invasion in 1940.

In an interviev given to Lithuanian television, the head of the Legal Department of the Lithuanian parliament, Juozas Zilys, said that foreigners and stateless persons would enjoy "almost unlimited" social and political rights. But they will not be allowed to take part in elections or be elected to bodies of state power. Service in Defence Department forces will not be compulsory for them either.

Vagnorius Stresses USSR Stability

LD2210205691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2008 gmt 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Serafim Bykhin]

[Text] Vilnius, 22 Oct (TASS)—"I have an interest in stability in the Soviet Union," Gedimanas Vagnorius, prime minister of the Lithuanian Republic said at a news conference today. According to Vagnorious, negative processes in the Soviet Union might have a negative effect on, primarily, the Lithuanian economy.

Touching on the prospects for relations with the Soviet Union, Gedimanas Vagnorius reiterated that Lithuania intends to pay that part of the USSR foreign debt which is equivalent to investments in the economy of the former Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Landsbergis Evaluates Belorussian Talks

OW2210185691 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1708 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the Lithuanian parliament Vytautas Landsbergis has positively evaluated the results of the Belorussian- Lithuanian talks in Minsk. In an interview with BALTFAX he added that the Lithuanian Government is preparing trade and econonic agreements between the two republics. He stressed that all this is a run-up to their inter-state treaty.

V. Landsbergis arrived in Minsk Oct 22, Tuesday. In the forenoon he had a tete-a-tete talk with the Chairman of the Belarus [Belorussia] Republic's Supremem Soviet Stanislav Shushkevich. Later the talks were continued between the delgations.

Stanislav Shushkevich has told a BALTFAX correspondent that the meeting has further improved the already good understanding between the two republics and urged more frequent personal contacts between their leaders to develop their inter-state relations. He mentioned his intention to pay a return visit to Lithuania.

Vitautas Landsbergis laid flowers on the stela in Victory Sqr. of Minsk in memory of guerillas fallen in World War II. He also visited Kuropati where mass executions by firing squad were carried out in Stalin's time and laid flowers on the tombstone marking the place.

Prunskiene: Landsbergis' Rule 'Authoritarian'

LD2210222191 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Gorokhov]

[Text] Stockholm October 22 TASS—There is a tendency towards a split threatening the emerging democracy in Lithuania, said former Lithuanian prime minister Kazimira Prunskiene, in an interview with the Swedish newspaper "DAGENS NYHETER".

Prunskiene accuses Lithuanian leaders of right-wing radicalism and nationalist populism. To her mind, authoritarian rule is being imposed on Lithuania, while political opponents are being declared traitors.

According to Prunskiene, President Landsbergis is trying to seize the glory of achieving independence for Lithuania, paying no attention to the fact that the road to independence was paved by democratic forces in Moscow, St. Petersburg and the whole of Russia, who rebuffed the reactionary coup attempt. The present-day political strategy depends on ideology and will lead Lithuania to a dead end if it ignores the realities. The official press is closed to politicians critical of the government.

The political atmosphere in Lithuania is poisoned, concludes the newspaper. Real democracy can only be reached in the course of a long and difficult process which cannot ignore world opinion, says "DAGENS NYHETER".

Economy Dependent on USSR Stability

LD2210225291 Moscow TASS in English 2243 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius October 23 TASS—Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius on Tuesday [22 October] said Lithuania's economy will depend on the stability in the Soviet Union.

"I am interested in the stability in the Soviet Union," Vagnorius told a news conference on Tuesday. He said negative processes in the country may affect the republican economy. The prime minister reiterated Lithuania will pay only part of the Soviet Union's foreign debt. The portion will equal to the Soviet Union's investments in the republic's economy.

Soviets Prevent Danish Plane From Landing

LD2210232591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2230 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] It was announced today that an incident in the Lithuanian airspace occurred yesterday as Soviet fighter planes prevented a Danish plane from landing in Vilnius. The plane, with experts of the World Health Organization, had to land in Warsaw. But after negotiations with Soviet institutions the incident was settled.

Supreme Soviet

Communists Fuel Parliament-Yeltsin Conflict

PM2210154491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 2

[Interview with Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Legislation Committee and state adviser, by L. Nikitinskiy on 19 October; place not given: "The Struggle Between Parliament and the President Could End in Defeat for Everyone"]

[Text] [Nikitinskiy] The suspension of the Communist Party's activity, far from weakening the influence of pro-communist factions in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, actually increased it markedly, in the view of Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the Legislation Committee and RSFSR state adviser. He sees this as one of the main reasons for the intensified confrontation between the Russian president and parliament.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which adopted a law "On Elections of Local Administration Heads" at the beginning of the month, set these elections for 8 December by special resolution. Parliament's decision prompted an objection from the RSFSR president, who asked the Supreme Soviet members to postpone the elections. After his proposed compromise was rejected, B. Yeltsin felt obliged to use a delaying veto: He sent the law back unsigned for further examination by the legislature.

On the same day, that is, 18 October, the "White House" was rocked by another resignation statement, this time from S. Shakhray, who asked to be released from his duties as chairman of the Legislation Committee and member of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. I met with him on 19 October and asked him some questions.

[Shakhray] Basically, we do not dispute that heads of administration locally, whatever their titles and peculiarities of status (presidents, mayors, city fathers), should be elected. It is not a question of criticizing a law that has already been adopted, only the timing of the elections.

Concern for the purity of democracy, which has become fashionable among Supreme Soviet members who at one time would not even offer their hand to democrats, could drain the life from it and destroy it, if democratic arguments about democracy fail to take into account the actual historical situation. Scheduling the elections of local administration heads for December, when a radical and urgent economic reform is on the agenda, has the sole aim of wrecking that reform.

Today the vertical structure of executive power relies on being taken on trust. Any attempt to change horses in midstream will finally ruin it, whatever the fine democratic pretext for doing this. Because in effect it will mean that for three or four months, the most crucial and tense months of the reform, there will be no effective power in the localities at all.

In the present atmosphere of destabilization and the threat of famine and cold, the chances of an election victory will increase for populist leaders who make irresponsible promises. In the event of victory, they will start tugging selfishly at the scanty blanket of our economy, which is already splitting at the seams.

For the sake of saving democracy, democratic elections of local administration heads should take place no earlier than the end of the first stage of economic reform, when the situation has at least partially stabilized.

[Nikitinskiy] These arguments appear convincing. This makes it all the more surprising that the legislators did not heed the president's request for a postponement of the elections.

[Shakhray] It is indeed inexplicable from the viewpoint of anyone who assesses the objective situation but does not speculate about subjective motives, which, unfortunately, are to an increasing extent determining the results of votes by many deputies and entire factions. The fact is that the struggle over the introduction of the post of Russian president and the presidential elections, a struggle that we all witnessed earlier this year, has not ended but has entered a new phase: Those groups of deputies that suffered defeat are now doing everything possible to discredit and paralyze presidential power.

I will say more. The suspension of the activity of official CPSU structures after the August putsch, far from weakening the pro-Communist factions in the Russian parliament, actually increased their activity markedly. A number of deputies who formerly combined their duties in the Supreme Soviet with nomenklatura posts in the CPSU and Russian communist party structures, as a result of which we did not often see them in parliament, have now been relieved of their "main work" and have switched over entirely to factional activity in the "White House." Ideally, that is how all members of parliament should work professionally, but because of the very specific feelings of these deputies, who are at times blinded by a sense of personal grievance, their selfless labor somehow proves unsatisfactory in the existing situation.

An analysis of the roll-call vote shows that the president's request for a postponement of the elections was blocked by two and a half factions in the Supreme Soviet: the well-known "Rossiya" and "Communists of Russia" groups, and half the "Smena" group.

[Nikitinskiy] Is it possible to get round the delaying veto, used by the president for the first time? What is your prediction?

[Shakhray] To do that, the president's opponents must win an overall majority; that is, a majority of the numbers on the roll, in each chamber. I hope they will not succeed, especially as B. Yeltsin, before using his

veto power, showed goodwill and readiness to compromise; otherwise, this will in effect mean a no confidence vote in the president, admittedly without the consequences stipulated in the Constitution, but involving drastic reshuffles and numerous resignations that will shake the "White House" to its foundations on the eve of the planned economic reform.

[Nikitinskiy] It remains to rely on the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies which opens on 21 October.

[Shakhray] Whatever decision the Supreme Soviet may adopt in the remaining week in connection with the presidential veto, the congress will in any case be faced with the need to resolve somehow the conflict between them or try to do so—not only in relation to the question of the timing of the elections of administration heads, but in a broader sense, in relation to the radical economic reform concept. As of today the president at last has such a concept, and communist structures and central structures are for the first time unable to tie his hands. It would be outrageous if he were now to be hobbled by the Russian people's deputies. This may be our last chance.

I think the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, for the duration of the period of economic reform, should rigorously coordinate its legislative activity with the president's programs. This applies, in particular, to draft social laws, the majority of which, unfortunately, are blatantly cost-based. We have gone on for long enough rubber-stamping hasty decisions without caring that there are no resources behind them. This populism will finally wreck Russia's finances and sever the fine thread by which it hangs above the abyss.

A truce must be called between the president and parliament and between factions within parliament, and the senseless struggle on the brink of the abyss must be stopped, if only in the face of a more terrible third force: famine, cold, economic ruin. I believe that with a view to ending the confrontation for the period of the implementation of economic reform, the prerogative of introducing draft economic laws should be handed over to the president. It is not a question of giving him legislative power or of granting the president any emergency powers, but only of making sure that all the activity of both president and parliament is subject to the requirements of radical economic reform.

I believe that the forthcoming Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies should adopt this conceptual decision, and then all the other questions facing it will be far easier to settle.

No Candidate for Soviet of Republics Chairman

LD2210100391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2200 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Text] The Russian deputation to the USSR Supreme Soviet of the new convocation decided at its session on 21 October not to nominate a Russian representative for the office of chairman of the Soviet of Republics. This is in order to avoid accusations from deputations from other republics of usurping power in order to avoid a schism at the session. According to the INTERFAX parliamentary correspondent, Vladimir Lukin, chairman of the International Affairs Committee of the Russian parliament, has been recommended for the office of interim deputy chairman of the Soviet of Republics. In a conversation with the INTERFAX correspondent, Lukin said that, in his opinion, the current USSR Supreme Soviet should not aspire to legislative functions. The best the session can do is to gain some moral authority that will be filled with legislative content as the years pass. That time will come once we realize that we cannot live apart, added Vladimir Lukin.

Rutskoy Announces Formation of Customs Service

OW2210121191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1115 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet has ruled to establish a state custom service within the republican government.

Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy told the Presidium meeting on Monday [21 October] that the first vice premier would simultaneously perform as head of the RSFSR State Customs Committee.

Fedorov Views Hearing on CPSU Role in Coup

LD2210210291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" program]

[Text] A hearing on the Communist Party's role in organizing the coup d'etat and in other illegal activities opened in Russia's parliament today.

[Begin N.V. Fedorov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Minister of Justice, recording] The main thing is that for the first time in our history the problem which is connected with the complete usurpation of all state structures by a single organization—the CPSU—is being discussed. It was revealed that in the process of making the documents public there was a total lack of distinction between the state budget and the party's coffers, and many millions, tens and hundreds of millions—that is, what we will have as a final result—were taken from the state budget, which was a poor state budget anyway in any case, for the support of various communist parties abroad, whether legal or illegal, in order to keep the leaders of those parties happy. In all, judging by everything, this is a truly major historic event when seen from the point of the prosecution possibilities.

What might be the result? Today, this party, as an all-Union party, has disintegrated in fact and in law. In

this situation, in accordance with Article 7 of the Constitution, the president of the Russian Federation has the duty to ban the activities of any organizational structures or any parties aiming at preserving such a system when a total violation of laws takes place, when some organization is speaking in favor of overthrowing the present order and takes part in coups d'etat, etc. It is the duty of the president of Russia to speak about the Constitution, about the political assessment and fate of the CPSU on the territory of the Russian Federation. Moreover, the Supreme Soviet has to tackle an issue relating to CPSU property. [end recording]

Parliament Considers Judicial Matters, Congress

LD2210165291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Text] The revival of the institution of elected justices of the peace as those nearest to the people, the jury-based court, and the introduction of posts of irremovable judges—these proposals from the subcommittee on judicial reform were considered today at a sitting of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet and were recommended for consideration by the Russian parliament. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet also considered the matter of progress in the preparations for the fifth extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. As was noted, the Russian president will possibly make an appeal to the people instead of a report at the congress, in order to avoid lengthy discussion of such a report and the drawing up of resolutions.

Paper Reports 16-17 Oct Session Proceedings

PM2310090191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by Robert Minasov and Olga Burkaleva under general heading: "Fourth Session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet": "Either Power Should Be Used or the Sluice Gates of Democracy Should Be Opened Wider"]

[Text] At the 16 October afternoon plenary sitting of the Supreme Soviet, deputies once again scrutinized the draft law on the indexation of citizens' monetary incomes and savings which has been under discussion since the spring and has passed its first reading.

It became clear at the sitting that all obstacles had been surmounted and it only remained to overcome various deputies' individual concerns. In the opinion of Mikhail Zakharov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic Commission for Social Policy, who presented the draft law, incomes must be index-linked. His point of view is completely understandable and it did not raise any objections, though the question does arise: From what sources?

In short, the issue simply was not resolved at this sitting.

Even while Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy was answering questions by people's deputies during the 17 October morning sitting, Ivan Galushko, one of the Supreme Soviet's most reputable members, expressed the assumption that Boris Yeltsin's request, contained in his address on the necessity to reschedule the elections of administration heads from 8 December to 1992, is nothing but a step toward introducing presidential rule in the republic. This was the actual stone which sent ripples across the water at yesterday's sitting.

Even persuasive arguments by Sergey Shakhray, Vitaliy Kulakov, Aleksey Surkov, and others speakers that it is unwise and disadvantageous to drag the whole Russian people into a protracted and costly election campaign in the present complex social and political situation evidently convinced very few people.

Vladimir Isakov and Aleksandr Veshnyakov, former chairman and former deputy chairman of one of the Supreme Soviet's chambers respectively, fueled the fire of controversy. The former even issued something akin to an ultimatum: He said that inasmuch as the president is again demanding additional powers necessary to exercise executive power more fully, the Supreme Soviet can grant them subject to certain political conditions. In other words, according to Isakov, if the executive power again turns out to be powerless in stabilizing the sociopolitical situation in the Russian Federation, parliament will be obliged to submit its resignation together with the president.

In general, many of those who participated in the discussion of the president's address at yesterday's morning sitting were, in our view, more concerned about their personal standing and the popularity rating of the Supreme Soviet as a whole, than about the means of overcoming misunderstandings between the president and the parliament. Dmitriy Stepanov, for example, stated that people will perceive the rescheduling of the elections of administration heads as an attempt to establish a dictatorship.

Ruslan Khasbulatov also failed to persuade the doubters.

The speech by Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, who spoke about the reasoning behind the presidential address, was effectively ignored. Aleksandr Vladimirovich noted that in the circumstances of a growing sociopolitical crisis and the absence of a new constitution and federal treaty, it is necessary to give the administration heads appointed by the president a chance to launch effective work to stabilize the situation.

Discussion around the president's address took up much of the Supreme Soviet members' time, although they themselves set quite a few complex tasks yesterday.

At the afternoon sitting, the deputies, without having reached a unanimous opinion on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president's address to parliament on postponing the election of administration heads until spring 1992, created a commission to finalize

the draft resolution on this question. A scrutiny of this commission's proposals is planned for the evening sitting.

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Appoints More Regional Representatives

PM2210154991 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 1

["Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic President's Decree on Representatives in Krays and Oblasts"—ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] With a view to coordinating the activity of organs of executive power of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR], krays, and oblasts, the following are to be appointed representatives of the RSFSR president:

Arkhangelsk Oblast Valeriy Samuilovich Krimnus;
Vologda Oblast Guriy Vasilyevich Sudakov;
Smolensk Oblast Mikhail Igorevich Semenov;
Tula Oblast Viktor Georgiyevich Kuznetsov; and
Ulanovsk Oblast Georgiy Ivanovich Stupnikov;

[Signed] B. Yeltsin, RSFSR president
[Dated] 16 October 1991, Moscow, Kremlin
Decree No. 144

Evidence Shows Ligachev Involvement in Coup

LD2210122891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] This is a report we have just received from TASS: There is evidence concerning the involvement of Yegor Ligachev, a former member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, in the August coup. This was reported today by Aleksey Surkov, member of the commission of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet investigating the actions of the State Committee for the State of Emergency during parliamentary hearings on the role of the organizational structures of the CPSU and the Russian Communist Party in the coup. Surkov noted that according to documents in the commission's possession, in the event of the success of the coup Yegor Ligachev might, at the next plenum of the CPSU, have occupied the post of CPSU general secretary. Surkov called upon those taking part in the hearings to request all the archive materials to give a full and objective assessment of the actions of the CPSU.

Justice Minister Levels Charges Against CPSU

OW2210160691 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] House of Soviets on Tuesday [22 October], the RSFSR Procurator-General Valentin Stepankov reported to parliamentarians on the Communist Party's role in the August coup. He said on August 19 and 20 the CPSU Central Committee sent out two coded telegrams urging the local party organizations to assist the State of Emergency Committee and regularly supply information about the popular mood.

According to Mr. Stepankov, apart from the "main" case under which 14 people have been arrested, charges of collaboration with the putschists have been brought against 36 heads of local administration.

The RSFSR Justice Minister Nikolay Fedorov read out a number of documents signed by the ex-chiefs of Central Committee departments Valentin Falin and Aleksander Vlasov. The documents prove that the CPSU regularly transferred considerable financial assistance to foreign communist parties and their firms.

Mr. Fedorov said the CPSU had systematically violated legislation on banks and banking activities and "used the state money as if it were its own." The justice minister urged Russia's parliament to pass a law on the CPSU property.

The RSFSR Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev observed that addressing financial claims to foreign communist parties "is well justified" but has to be preceded by "serious analysis of similar practices in other countries."

Prime Ministerial Candidates Assessed

PM2210104191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Oct 91 First Edition p 1

[Commentary by Vladimir Kuznechevskiy: "Who Will Head the Government of People's Confidence?"]

[Text] The governmental crisis in the White House has gotten a little protracted. This allows us to reach the conclusion that B. Yeltsin is experiencing difficulties in recruiting the key figure—a candidate for the post of prime minister. No one doubts that it is his job to do this. R. Khasbulatov openly said at a recent news conference: The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president should provide the name of the prime minister. What is the difficulty?

To all appearances, B. Yeltsin realizes as well as anyone that the prime minister's appointment governs not only the character of the administration, which will basically comprise two persons—the president and his prime minister—but also the resolution of a more profound and complex problem: whether or not we succeed in stabilizing the economic situation in the republic in the coming months. The situation is complex, not only because the economic situation is getting catastrophically worse. In spite of all M. Gorbachev's efforts and B. Yeltsin's support for these efforts, we will not succeed in

saving the USSR either politically or, it seems, economically. The logic of the republics' aspiration for full independence turned out to be greater than the USSR president's energy, efforts, and logic. It does not look as if the USSR president is coming to terms with this objective reality. But the Russian president will nevertheless clearly have to come to the conclusion that at the present stage of our historical development there remains no other way out for Russia today than to meet this republic logic halfway and to go over immediately to creating a new Russian statehood in the economic and political spheres.

You can understand the Russian president. A mistake in his choice could cost the Russians and Yeltsin himself a lot. As the great Dante wrote: "What is needed here is for the soul to stand firm; in this matter fear must not give counsel." It is a hopeful sign that in such important matters Yeltsin has not previously erred. Everybody remembers the seemingly obvious, but nevertheless unrealized, alliance in the summer of 1990 between Yeltsin, who had been elected chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and prospective prime minister M. Bocharov. Despite all Bocharov's undoubted talent, something showed up in him that stopped Yeltsin and prevented him from choosing him. Now, a year later, it seems to me that this "something" was that Yeltsin did not see a guarantee of stability in this alliance, and stability is essential to him in the face of the range of forces present among the RSFSR people's deputies. He was searching for a person who would provide this stability and he found him. Yeltsin offered the premiership to I. Silayev, and rightly so. For several reasons the alliance with Silayev provided him with the extra support of a number of deputies, including even a section of the communist deputies, which in the final account allowed him to carry out a reorganization of the system of power in Russia—and get a decision through the Congress and Supreme Soviet to introduce a presidential system and subsequently also win the presidential election. In my opinion, however, from the viewpoint of governing Russia, I. Silayev did not turn out to be the right man, and Yeltsin saw this almost immediately. This was partly because Silayev had difficulty in overcoming in himself the old Bolshevik concept of the world according to which Russia is the USSR's center and the Union should be preserved on Russia's account. Another factor was equally important. From literally the first days, it was clear that Silayev's overly mild and intellectual character was inappropriate for a Russian government forced to act in the extreme conditions of an economic situation that was worsening all the time. These human characteristics, which would undoubtedly be positive in any other circumstances in life, proved a minus in these extreme circumstances. Evidently, Yeltsin always understood this, and in recent times Silayev himself has begun to sense it, too. To the credit of both members of this alliance, they managed not to spoil their personal relations, concluding, moreover, that a weakness in some circumstances can prove a strength in others; and they achieved this chemical reaction in the political field. With his promotion to the job of chairman of the Interrepublic Economic Committee (which is what the Union government is now called), all Silayev's existing qualities combined with his greatly enhanced prestige in the wake of the August events acquire a completely different value, as rigidity and determination are exactly the opposite of what is needed now from the head of the Union cabinet.

Typically, however, the mass media, citing a leak from sources close to Yeltsin, have for a long time been naming as Silayev's successors Yu. Skokov, O. Lobov, Yu. Petrov, R. Khasbulatov, and Sv. Fedorov. There is no one exceptional in this list of people. All of them, besides differing among themselves, differ from Silayev in one respect—they are more decisive, more strong-willed; in other words the trend is clear. I dare say, however, that whereas even six months ago possessing this quality might have been sufficient for holding so high an office (of course, while also meeting all the other requirements of competence, experience, etc.), today this quality alone is clearly no longer enough.

The Russian premier in the present circumstances must meet a more varied range of quality requirements, and within that variety there must be more certainty. In the first place, he must be a person who not only understands that we will have to stabilize the Russian economy in conditions of, so to say, free float but is literally fired by the idea. He must be competent in the enterprise sphere and feel totally at home in conditions of competitive existence and the functioning of economic entities. He must be opposed to monopolies in the area of the national economy (that is, a representative of, say, the military-industrial complex would not be suitable here). He must be an organizer for whom business relations with foreign countries are just as natural as internal economic ties. Finally, the candidate for this post must have a pretty clear idea of where the Russian economy should be going in this transitional period, what organizational forms it should adopt, and, most important, all the above must be examined through the prism of realizing the interests of the specific human individual in the improvement of his own daily lot. In short, in my view he must be a person of Svyatoslav Fedorov's stature—given, of course, that such a person would agree to sacrifice himself for Russia and for Russians at a time like this.

Deputies Prepare for Republican Congress

TASS Assesses Legislative Scene

LD2210191591 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—Three candidates for Russian parliamentary speaker, including acting speaker

Ruslan Khasbulatov, will be nominated at the forthcoming session of the republican congress, according to the chairman of the council of the legislature's factions.

Speaking in a TASS interview, Vladimir Novikov named Sergey Baburin and Sergey Shakhray as the two other likely nominees.

If none of them is elected, "others from our strategic reserve will be proposed", Novikov added. He declined to identify them.

The fifth session of the Russian congress, which began last July, was interrupted after failing to elect a parliament speaker and set to resume on October 28.

Whereas previously two major caucases competed at congressional sessions—the Communists of Russia and Democratic Russia, now the number of registered factions has increased to 14, Novikov said.

He pointed to Smena (which can be roughly translated as "fresh blood") as one of the most active. It insists on unswerving compliance with laws, even if they are outdated and imperfect. Smena was the first to point out to Russian President Boris Yeltsin that some of his edicts contradict republican laws.

The Rossiya (Russia) faction, in contrast, readily changes its decisions and acts unpredictably, according to Novikov.

The newly-founded Industrial Alliance Group unites production managers and executives believing that "a bad system of administration is still better than the absence of any".

Novikov described the Agrarian Alliance as one of the most conservative caucuses.

Others on parliament's political spectrum include such groups as radical democrats and non-party democrats.

Despite differences in their positions, the factions' leaders meeting on October 21 worked out common proposals for the congress, suggesting that it should discuss the social and economic situation in Russia and a new republican constitution.

Khasbulatov Previews Issues

PM2310080591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 1

[Report on interview with Ruslan Khasbulatov, acting chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, by Tamara Zamyatina; place and date not given: "Avoiding a Split"]

[Text] The Fifth Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies is called upon to demonstrate a guarantee of changes, Ruslan Khasbulatov, acting chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, told the TASS correspondent. "We must convince the people," he elaborated, "that all the power structures are seeking a way out of the crisis rather than engaging in internal strife."

He described talk about the parliament's switch to opposing the RSFSR president as an "exaggeration of the problem." In his opinion, the point is that the president is seeking to strengthen executive power, while the Supreme Soviet is called upon to uphold the institutions of representative power. Ruslan Khasbulatov does not consider the presidential veto of the Supreme Soviet decision to hold elections of heads of administrations on 8 December as a panacea for strengthening executive power: "No one is preventing the president from taking energetic steps toward strenthening the government. After all, ultimately it controls executive power along the vertical, and that includes exercising such control in the local Soviets. And if there is no head in the shape of a capable government, how else can executive power at local level be strengthened?"

The TASS correspondent's interlocutor expressed regret over the fact that "a balance, a golden mean" was not found within the walls of the White House "in the dispute on the elections of administration heads." An agreement to the effect that in regions where elections are thwarted administration heads are to be appointed by presidential decree ought to have been reached.

Khasbulatov regards the "mighty slide into a socioeconomic crisis" a "much worse problem" than the aforementioned differences. Therefore, the upcoming Congress should, in his opinion, take place under the banner of the unification of all democratic forces; it is necessary to avoid a split inside Russia during the congress on the lines of that which occurred in the Union.

Boris Yeltsin will deliver a report to the congress on the socioeconomic and political situation in Russia. "We are entitled to expect swift steps from the Congress toward a mixed market economy, and also the implementation of major transformations in banking, finance, and the monetary policy, and in the sphere of privatization," the acting chairman said.

Ruslan Khasbulatov declined to answer a question on the elections of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman at the congress, saying: "I have a vested interest here."

Democratic Communists Hold Regional Conference

PM2310102391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 91 p 2

[V. Nikiforova report under the rubric: "In Parties and Movements": "Pleasant in Every Respect, But Loved?"]

[Text] The Democratic Party of Communists of Russia [DPCR]—that is the name under which it was registered 18 September this year—held its Moscow regional conference on 19 October.

The organization is growing more slowly than expected, the party and conference organizers said, because there is a growing number of other parties. And the main point is that the CPSU members—the basic reserve—are letting the side down. Whereas before the putsch they were joining the DPCR, they jave not been doing so since the August events, despite the fact that a new name is being proposed: the Party of Free Russia.

There was another opinion that was also noticeable in the discussion: The DPCR, whatever it may be called at the congress, must rely on the middle class, on the entrepreneurs—they can give the party money.

Arguments developed on an organizational aspect: Does the party need a regional apparatus? It will be enough to have a coordinator, some people thought. And who will do the work? Those who had experienced the daily grind in the party were indignant. RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Vice President A. Rutskoy, chairman of the DPCR Council, clarified matters. Speaking about the new party as a parliamentary one, he described its tasks: to support President B. Yeltsin and hold elections to new soviets and administrations in an organized way. To do this, it is necessary to influence the voters, which means that an apparatus is needed, too; for example, if there is a party organization in Istrinskiy or Mozhayskiy Rayon, money could be transferred to its account (state money, of course)—and let is cultivate its own plot, as it were.

Unfortunately, everything goes back to square one: Without a strong and authoritative political party, you cannot revive Russia or... build capitalism. To put it briefly, the new people in power need their own party.

Unfortunately, these arguments and emotional speeches overshadowed the speech made by Moscow City Soviet Deputy V. Prokhorov, who said with pain and despair that City Hall has virtually declared civil war on the Moscow City Soviet, and that privatization of state enterprises is going on on the quiet, with the result that the worker, the person who toils, is left with nothing.

It is strange that the word "democracy" has, through frequent use, penetrated all the pores of the hall, but only the odd person mentioned the people and their future. Is this not one of the reasons why CPSU members have lost their interest in a new state party?

Economy Official Discusses Currency Reform

PM2210135391 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Oct 91 p 1

[Interview with First Deputy Economics Minister Ivan Materov by Sergey Nikitin; place and date not given: "Let's Wait Until the Spring for Our Own Currency"]

[Text] A statement about the coming monetary reform and liberalization of prices in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] was made to parliamentarians on 15 October during an address by the leadership of the State Council. We asked Ivan Materov, RSFSR First Deputy Economics Minister, to comment on the situation.

[Nikitin] Ivan Sergeyevich, as far as we are aware, the questions connected with issuing Russian currency and liberalizing prices have been thoroughly elaborated in your ministry. The State Council's "gambit" was clearly not a surprise to you then, was it?

[Materov] I very much regret that the statement was a surprise to us, too. There is as yet no detailed program or mechanism for its practical implementation in existence.

Do you remember the 500 Days Program? People said at the time: "The Union has declined, but we will carry out the program anyway." In fact, however, we kept putting it off and putting it off.... The same old story will be repeated this time too, I fear.

But imagine the kind of commotion will emerge after the statement. The RSFSR population, whom no one has kept informed, will panic and start selling their old rubles [R]. A torrent of "Monopoly money" will pour in from the Baltic, the Ukraine, Central Asia, and Transcaucasia. It will be used to buy up raw materials, commodities, livestock, and real estate or will simply be put into Russian savings banks in the hope of exchanging them later for our new currency.

[Nikitin] How do you really see the process of putting new money into circulation in Russia?

[Materov] There will not be enough capacity to issue union rubles and new Russian rubles simultaneously. One solution would be to change some detail on our bank notes, overlaying with a special stripe, let's say. But leaving union rubles, by agreement with the republics, for reciprocal settlements. Something like the ECU in the EEC.

But the "striped ruble" is a weak currency. We are unlikely to be able to support it through our internal resources and it will quickly depreciate against the dollar. Therefore, obtaining a certain reserve, $3 billion, say, from the IMF will be the second stage. Naturally, the IMF will only do this after we have launched our economic reform in earnest (the process of privatizing state property constitutes the first phase) and, of course, after reconstructing [rekonstruirovaniye] the RSFSR's foreign debt. The latter question needs to be worked up in detail: Either we ask for a rescheduling of payments or we issue Bank for Foreign Economic Activity bonds, which will defer our debt clearance.

A Russian hard currency will have to be firmly "harnessed" to this reserve for some time . If it amounts, say, to $3 billion, at a rate of 1 to 15 we will obtain the right to print R45 billion, and only when our economy gets off its knees can the volume of our national currency be increased without our having to keep a wary eye on the dollar reserves.

We have to make careful preparations, however, for the way is strewn with pitfalls. While our new currency is being introduced and the union ruble exists in parallel, a rate will immediately be set up between them, and speculation will start.

[Nikitin] Of course, this must all be considered in advance.... By means of our own currency we will protect ourselves against the republics without recognizing Union rubles one fine day. But in what situation will we place those republics which are not in a position to introduce their own currencies?

[Materov] Virtually all the states, except Russia, which have neither the technical potential nor convertible currency to place orders abroad, will encounter such a problem. One option is to give them our current Soviet rubles for domestic use.

[Nikitin] Let's now talk about the liberalization of prices which has been proclaimed. This too, after all, is a brain teaser, is it not?

[Materov] Imagine that tomorrow we free prices without any restrictions whatsoever. Their overall index will increase at least tenfold. How is the ordinary person supposed to live? The program that we are drawing up in our ministry proposes introducing a narrow contract system, that is, a narrow consumer "basket," for which a separate section of the Russian budget would be allocated. Money to subsidize goods and essential services, irrespective of their price increase, would thus be reserved. The state would purchase food, electricity, and so forth from producers at market prices, and they would be granted to the consumer at hard state prices. A minimum subsistence level would thus be ensured. There is no need of indexation of any sort. Indexation will destroy the Russian economy. At any rate in the form envisaged by the Supreme Soviet's current draft.

[Nikitin] But what, in your opinion, could be the consequence of the liberalization of prices on strategic goods and raw materials? Oil, for instance?

[Materov] Today a tonne of oil costs $2 on the domestic market, while it costs $120 on the outside market. If you place no restriction on its price increase in the form of duties, quotas, and other similar mechanisms, it will go up for Russian consumers by more than 50 times! You can imagine what that could set in train? The borders will have to be closed to prevent all the oil heading out.

We need to start, however, by developing a system of rent payments. As the owner of the mineral wealth, the state has the right to part of either what is extracted or the income (which, incidentally, nobody has decided either) of the oil producer. The rent, on coming into the state budget, will "damp down" the producers' desire to export the lot.

But, I repeat, the liberalization mechanism has to be determined first.

[Nikitin] In other words, you do not think that the State Council leadership approached the experts before addressing the parliamentarians.?

[Materov] I do not think they did.

[Nikitin] And how much time could be needed to carry out the necessary preparatory measures?

[Materov] Six months at least.

Judges Complain of 'Pressure' From Deputies

PM2310101191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 3

[By Sergey Kornilov: "Judiciary: Starting From Scratch"]

[Text] The first All-Russian Congress of Judges has ended in Moscow.

The delegates discussed two outline plans for reforming the judicial system. Most of the speakers at the congress insisted that individual provisions of the reform should be put into practice right now. These include abolishing the judges' duty to write reasoned decisions that take up a vast amount of time, transferring private suits to the category of administrative suits, freeing the Prosecutor's Office from participation in civil cases and the obligation to take part in criminal cases, and relieving judges of the function of presenting charges.

A statement adopted by the judges at the congress states:

"Methods of direct or indirect pressure on the courts, as practiced by the administrative edict system, and the desire to subordinate them to its will and its interests have been readily taken over by individual people's deputies and representatives of sociopolitical movements." In this context proposals were put forward at the congress to impose greater liability for contempt of court and to transfer offenses of this kind from the administrative category to the category of criminal procedure [iz razryada administrativnyykh v razryad protsessualnykh].

Addressing the congress, Russian Deputy S. Shakhray, state counsellor for legal questions, stated that, acting on behalf of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president, he will be submitting on Monday an outline plan for the reform of the judicial system to the Presidium, and that he is hoping to present it to Russia's Supreme Soviet soon.

Concern Voiced Over Russia's Ethnic Policies

PM2310102791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 91 p1

[Interview with N.P. Medvedev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet

Commission on the National-State System and Interethnic Relations, by A. Khokhlov; place and date not given: "Russian Diplomacy: Troika on a Bumpy Road"]

[Text] Nikolay Pavlovich Medvedev, 38, Mordvin Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] people's deputy, holds three higher diplomas in education, economics, and political science. Currently studying at the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy. Married with two children. Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Commission on the National-State System and Interethnic Relations.

[Khokhlov] Russian leaders have recently launched into some intense peacemaking activity. Yeltsin has visited Karabakh in tandem with Kazakh President Nazarbayev. Khasbulatov and Rutskoy have been to the Chechen-Ingush ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. Kalugin and Kunadze have been to Sakhalin and the Kurils. But, to be honest, the results are deplorable. The situation has become worse after every one of these visits. Russian diplomacy's only "plus" at the moment is your commission's recent visit to Moldova, where you were able to keep apart the opposing sides. Why are there so many "minuses"?

[Medvedev] I do not want to assess individuals or the reasons for their visits; that would be rather presumptuous. But, unfortunately, it is becoming a bad tradition that the Russian parliament deals with certain issues in an offhand manner, including highly complex issues like interethnic relations.

As far as Boris Nikolayevich's visit to Karabakh is concerned... I feel that there are some examples where his apparatus has not acted professionally. Notices have been pinned up all over the White House announcing that groups are being formed to visit the provinces. But who is forming these groups and for what purpose? I get the impression that some deputies are rushing to hot spots simply to show off in front of the television cameras and earn some cheap prestige. When we—the people professionally trained to deal with ethnic problems—have to follow in the wake of "amateurs," we are obliged to rectify our colleagues' mistakes on top of everything else.

A mistake made by many politicians in the republics and in Russia itself is that they are unable to define what is meant by a subject of state. It is said—virtually at parliamentary level—that the indigenous nation as an ethnic group is the deciding factor. The United States is given as an example, but the American nation is a totally different concept. In our country, subjects of state can only mean the people living in a specific territory. The Dnestr referendum was illegal from a juridical viewpoint. In the same way, some actions by the Moldovan militia cannot be regarded as according with the spirit of the law: Our commission has recorded human rights violations.

[Khokhlov] But have some actions been "justified" by political necessity?

[Medvedev] That is the problem. It is a time of political declarations in our country. Fortunately, we were able to get away from this in Moldova and tackle the very real task of separating armed people.

[Khokhlov] What is your prediction: Are we going to see conflicts between "nationals" and "Russian speakers" in other former Union republics?

[Medvedev] I would like to believe that we are not. But there are problems. You can understand the feelings of someone who has lived in the Soviet Union and then suddenly finds himself on the territory of another state, where laws on language are being adopted and he is no longer regarded as a citizen with full rights. I myself would feel very uncomfortable.

Russia will not leave its compatriots to face their problems alone. All treaties with the republics include clauses that make special reference to the rights of the Russian-speaking population. But, to be honest, we have done nothing more than shuffle papers. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet often works like that now: Form is observed, but there is no substance. There are gaping holes of unresolved problems in the hastily concluded interrepublic treaties. Russian politicians' task now is to bring form closer to content. As far as Moldova is concerned, the first step toward a settlement should be followed up with an agreement on the possibility of dual citizenship for those who want it.

This is bound to meet with opposition in the republics. Many of their leaders believe that the young states are already fully sovereign. This is a dangerous absolute. None of us can avoid a transitional period. Forcing the pace of political processes threatens to stir up conflict. No state can be built overnight—however much some politicians may ring the bells of populism.

[Khokhlov] The situation is now extremely worrying in Russia itself.

[Medvedev] The interethnic card is being played by many political forces. We are doing everything possible to nip conflicts in the bud. The Soviet of Nationalities has its own forecasting services, and several institutes and independent experts work for us. Unfortunately, few heed our conclusions and recommendations.

[Khokhlov] Why?

[Medvedev] The problem of the Russian authorities—which are still unsettled at the moment—is that there are a great many people in the White House who are eager to become Napoleons. Personal ambition, rather than reason, is the predominant factor. If we do not cure democracy's infantile disease and work together to draft a new RSFSR Constitution, the forecast for the future is not very comforting. The "sovereignization" that we will begin to see within the republic will be such that...

[Khokhlov, interrupting] How then should we regard B. Yeltsin's well-known theory on sovereignty—that Russia will give all autonomous formations as much as they can "carry away"?

[Medvedev] A clear line must be drawn between a nation's rights—revival as an ethnic group, concern for its language, and so forth—and the inciting of interethnic discord. The latter is a criminal offense, and the Criminal Code must apply. But we have gotten everything confused, which is why Boris Nikolayevich's words have been interpreted in various ways. Nor must we forget the situation in which Yeltsin talked about sovereignty. Think back to April 1990: The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the "Law on Demarcating Powers Between the USSR and Members of the Federation," in which 20 autonomous formations were immediately placed on the same footing as Union republics. Now 35 separate members are too many even for our great country! We Russians now have to sort out the legal nonsense created by Union parliamentarians.

[Khokhlov] Will we be able to? Or will there be civil war?

[Medvedev] I do not think so. If I said "yes," then what are we parliamentarians being paid for? But I have a great many doubts about the Russian Supreme Soviet efficiently tackling interethnic problems. I do not like everything being done by the new democratic power in this sensitive, explosive sphere. Many important politicians believe that our interethnic problems are only temporary. Wait until we adopt a new constitution, they say, and then everything will fall into place. But they are wrong.

Generally speaking, my greatest concern is the revival of Lenin's postulate about the cook at the helm of power. Doctors, teachers, and economists are now taking it on themselves to try to resolve the complex problems of interethnic relations. They say that there are no professionals to be found anywhere. But what about our former cadres? The emphatic response to this is: They are tainted by their membership of the CPSU. But that is the way our country was: Everyone—from minister to collective farm team leader—was a member of the party! Where are we going to find other professionals? Besides, why should we need to look elsewhere? People's "biography" is not the only important thing. Above all else we need wise, experienced professionals who have not compromised themselves in any way.

Action to resolve urgent problems is the most important task now—not political declarations. We could copy half of the U.S. or German Constitution into ours, but we would not solve Russia's nationality problems in that way. Russia's history is a special history. And our problems are special. We must not follow the Bolsheviks' example and divide everything into ours and theirs. Everything is ours. We must assess Lenin's and Stalin's nationality policy as formalistic and nonviable. But we cannot allow ourselves to make more mistakes on top of theirs.

Lawmen Under Investigation in Racket Case

PM2210132791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2050 GMT 16 Oct 91

[By L. Lashchenko; from the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Text] [Lashchenko] News from 38 Petrovka [Moscow police headquarters]. Nine people have been detained. During a search 1.7 million Soviet rubles, U.S. $300,000, gold and silver ware, antiques, old icons, radios, and video equipment were confiscated from them. And that is far from being all that the criminals had. They also had links with staff at the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity [Vneshekonombank] and foreign currency store workers. Thus they could apply without waiting in line to withdraw foreign currency from accounts at the Vneshekonombank and obtain, also without waiting in line, essential goods from those stores. And they passed themselves off as workers from a cooperative providing a service to people with foreign currency in obtaining cars and other equipment.

[A.P. Bugayev, deputy chief of the Moscow City Internal Affairs Main Administration] The investigation will also have to prove the disinterested participation both of law enforcement agency personnel and, primarily, of our inquiry as well as prosecutor's office workers, because victims had appealed a number of times to the militia department but it was decided, as a rule, not to institute criminal proceedings on the basis of their statements for want of evidence of a crime.

Lopatin Calls For Russian Defense Structures

PM2210114491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 1

[Interview with Colonel V. Lopatin, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic State Committee for Defense Questions, by A. Khokhlov; place and date not given: "Who Would Do His Service on the Taymyr Peninsula?"]

[Text] [Khokhlov] Your opinion on the August events—the last upheaval for our country?

[Lopatin] I was and remain committed to the view that 19-21 August was the culminating point of a coup which had a beginning and has yet to reach its denouement. The timeframe and the form it takes will depend on the speed with which the Russian authorities resolve priority tasks. These include the formation of executive power structures through the appointment of heads of administration, a thorough "purge" of the apparatus, the prevention of further splits in the democratic movement, an end to the pursuit of foreign credits until such time as our needs are accurately defined, the demonopolization and privatization of the state trade network, and the formulation of a military policy.

[Khokhlov] One after another, the former union republics, now sovereign republics, are rapidly providing

themselves with their own armed forces. And only Russia has thus far not expressed its attitude to the army, to defense problems. Why not?

[Lopatin] That is not entirely true. Russia has declared its position, but unfortunately, it was not heard....

Maybe because Russia has no clear policy in the defense sphere. Although there are more than 800 military-industrial enterprises on its territory and it pays two-thirds of the military budget and is the main supplier of material and technical resources, as well as manpower.

Another problem is that Russia has no structures to formulate military policy. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for Defense Questions, on the whole, exists only on paper. We work virtually on a voluntary basis, but even the proposals we do formulate are seldom taken up.

The military-industrial complex can become involved in the economic reform only after we have first determined the real level of our military expenditure, taking into account all hidden and indirect costs at real prices. Then defense spending will total not 100 billion rubles [R], as was declared for 1991, but at least R500 billion. It is necessary to conduct an urgent expert review of military-industrial programs with a view to rationalizing them and reducing them by one-half. It is extremely important by the end of the year to classify military-industrial enterprises according to their products and to define sources of finance for 1992. Plants that produce dual-purpose products must be transferred to the civilian sphere, and specialized plants should be financed through the Defense Ministry. At plants that have not received orders, the military production line must be halted, with only the workers' wages being paid.

It is necessary to define both the sources and the categories of defense finance in republic and joint budgets. The military budget requires a 30-40 percent reduction and item-by-item approval. It should be controlled by a single "master"—the military department, which should also order arms and equipment on a competitive basis. The budget structure should be aligned with world standards: two-thirds for the maintenance of personnel, the rest for weapons.

[Khokhlov] Probably the question of the draft should also be tackled urgently.

[Lopatin] Yes, certainly. The USSR president signed a decree on this subject. But today all the republics have announced that young men will serve according to the territorial principle—"do your service where you live." Only volunteers will go outside the borders of the sovereign states, and even then on a quota basis. So who is going to serve on the Taymyr Peninsula?

[Khokhlov] Were all these innovations discussed with Russia?

[Lopatin] Not a single question was discussed with our committee. Conversion, the budget, the draft, alternative forms of service, the institution of the national guard—all these are current questions that must be tackled without delay. We come back yet again to the urgent need to set up defense structures in Russia.

Social organizations are trying to fill the vacuum. When the state of Russia shows no interest in creating a national guard, the informal groups start to man such a guard. The formation of the guard, however, should take place after the adoption of a law on the matter, and the guard should be set up on the basis of the existing elite units and subunits.

[Khokhlov] Coups are usually staged by the Army or with the help of the Army. For six years the military were "fed" promises of reform, but nothing changed for the better in their service or life, rather the reverse. In the worst-case scenario, might the Army turn against the authorities?

[Lopatin] With the arrival of a new defense minister, the armed forces have a new chance to implement reform. Depoliticization and departyization are taking place, and servicemen's pay has at last been increased. I repeat, there is now hope, but the skepticism of many officers must also be taken into account. The increase in salaries has not brought the regimental commander any closer in material terms to the trolley bus driver—the bus driver still gets more. But the main point is this: It is still not clear. What lies in store for the Army and Navy tomorrow?

Only the radical and rapid implementation of military reform can save the situation.

The new center, in the shape of the State Council, is obviously delaying. Its Committee for Military Reform still consists of nothing but a USSR presidential decree and a chairman, General Kobets.

Things have gone no further than that. Although proposals have been drawn up on the committee's structure, tasks, and composition, and these proposals were agreed with a number of republics. But they have not been taken up. Yesterday, once again, the USSR president was briefed solely on USSR Defense Ministry provisioning. There is a draft military reform concept, which was published by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA long ago. This draft underwent a general expert review among the troops, and its realism was demonstrated in practice. But today I have received a request from Gen. Kobets: Do not send this draft to anyone. Strange, to say the least...

It is necessary this year clearly to demarcate the leadership and control of defense at the political, administrative, and properly military levels, with collegial representation of the republics at the first two of these levels. Functions must be divided out between the Defense Ministry and the General Staff. A council of republics' defense ministers and an RSFSR Defense Ministry must be set up.

A defense union of republics must be concluded by way of bilateral and multilateral agreements, with a view to integration into the collective European security system.

One last point: Legislative acts are needed: on preventing the use of armed forces for internal political purposes, on exemption from accountability for failure to fulfill a criminal order, on the status of the serviceman and equal social guarantees irrespective of place of service, on a 50-100 percent increase in wages for servicemen and Defense Ministry workers and employees, on the formation of a national guard, and on alternative forms of service.

National Guard Initiator Comments on Project

OW2310084991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian at 2330 GMT 28 September 91 in the "Serving the Fatherland" program carries Aleksandr Ostrovskiy's video report "Russian Guard: What Should They Be?" on the creation of the Russian National Guard.

[Video starts with brief interviews with military and militia personnel who express a variety of opinions on the goals and structure of the proposed Russian National Guard. Video then cuts to show soldiers on parade, and Su-27 jet fighters with their noses painted with the words "Russkiye Vityazi, Russian Knights," taxiing and in flight formation] Ostrovskiy says: "Russian Guard. Today, people talk and argue about them a lot. Opinions about their purpose are often very much in conflict. If we look at history, we will see that the Guard was created during state upheavals and changes of power. The Guard was staffed with officers, clerks, and even teachers. I would not like to draw comparisons, but something similar is happening in our country, too.

"The outline of the National People's Guard concept has been completed at our White House. The main work was done by the former committee for the protection of the Supreme Soviet during the coup. Even for those uniformed specialists of the armed forces, many things were new.

"This is the reason that one of the chief planners of the project, namely, Gennadiy Savelyevich Yankovich, was so terse and careful in choosing his words".

[Video shows soldiers assisting in the harvest, barricades from the days of the coup attempt, then cuts to an open-air interview with Yankovich]

[Yankovich] "This will truly be a people's Guard. Its first duty is to protect the state structures, which is the will of the people. This is its main purpose."

[Ostrovskiy] "What will it be doing in peacetime when there is no need to use force?"

[Yankovich] "It will occupy itself with certain types of training so that it will be able to demonstrate its strength in extreme situations, thus preserving the state structures and guaranteeing those rights of the Soviet people which (?are in force) in our country."

[Ostrovskiy] "What should be the size of the Guard?"

[Yankovich] "It is difficult to estimate their number now. But we envision its creation in several stages. First, there will be armed units of competitively-selected, highly-trained professionals. Second, there will be reserves consisting of guys who, having passed the competitive selection process, will be kept in the reserves. Lastly, all of the people will naturally support its National Guard, and there are several possible methods of support".

[Ostrovskiy] "I have heard that registration for the Guards is already underway".

[Yankovich] "I think that the registration is premature. Registration may be organized after a presidential decree is issued, which is the legal way".

[Video cuts to show a conscription office in Moscow, interviews with male and female volunteers explaining their reasons for joining the Guard, an interview with Lieutenant Colonel Solovyev who says that between 250 and 350 people have signed up in a single day, that selection is based on age only, and that the registration of volunteers is meant to guide patriotic sentiments into proper channels. Video then cuts show an interview with V.Urazhtsev, president of the Shchit Union, who says that the Guard will be answerable only to the president of the Russian Soviet Federated Republic, and criticizes the regular army as a corrupt tool of the Communist Party. Video cuts to show Soviet Deputies D. Volkogonov and V. Lopatin who, according to Ostrovskiy, sharply objected to the unsanctioned registration of the Guard. Video then shows an interview with a militiaman who criticizes the establishment of the Guard, and an interview with General V. Lobov, chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces] Lobov says: "The best and the bravest of the defenders were called the Guards. And now we are talking about the Guard again; it has not been forgotten. We are beginning to form republican and national guards. What do we mean by this? It would seem that what we mean is that the best parts of our society will join the Guard, and also the best part of our armed forces, that is, people who are now defending our Motherland with arms in their hands. The Guard has a future." [Video than shows soldiers on parade, while Ostrovskiy cautions against misusing the Guards, as they have been, for example, in Georgia. Video concludes with shots of jet fighters taking off]

Privatization Efforts Termed 'Unsatisfactory'

OW2310043991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 2156 GMT 22 Oct 91

[From the "Soviet Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] During a meeting on Tuesday [22 October] the Russian Parliamentary Committee on Economic Reform evaluated the efforts towards fulfilling the republican government law on privatization as "unsatisfactory" and called for the immediate development of a concrete program to induce privatization.

Mikhail Maley, chairman of the State Property Fund, accused regional powers of hampering the creation of regional funds for state property, which are supposed to be responsible for the practical work of privatization. In his words, such funds have been organized in only four regions.

Local Affairs

Sharp Increase in Tension in Chechen-Ingushetia

IZVESTIYA Update on Events

PM2210144391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by A. Kazikhanov: "Preparing To Fight in Groznyy. Sharp Increase in Tension in Chechen-Ingushetia"]

[Text] Groznyy—The grounds were provided by Russian President B. Yeltsin's statement announcing a three-day deadline for lifting the blockade of the public state buildings which have been seized in the republic and disarming the formations created by the All-National Chechen Congress Executive Committee. The statement voices confidence that the parliamentary elections will be held 17 November in strict accordance with the decision adopted earlier. It was a forced statement, for the efforts of a large group of Russian parliamentarians, who tried to find a compromise in the republic, were not crowned with success.

The rally by supporters of the All-National Chechen Congress Executive Committee, which ended on 19 October, has returned to the boil in the square in front of the House of Soviets. One of the "Murids" [opponents of Russian power in Caucasus in 19th century] appeared on local television, reported that troops were moving toward Chechen-Ingushetia, and urged all who are able to handle weapons to gather in the square. A National Guard detachment and representatives of the All-National Chechen Congress Executive Committee Defense Staff left urgently for Stavropol Kray to check out the report that units of USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Internal Troops and of the Soviet Army were assembling in Mineralnyye Vody in order to head for Chechen-Ingushetia on the expiry of the three-day deadline announced by the Russian president.

The Chechen Republic Electoral Commission for the Elections of the President and Parliament has agreed on four presidential candidates: They are D. Dudayev, chairman of the All-National Chechen Congress Executive Committee; R. Gaytemirov, leader of the "Green Movement"; M. Sulayev, chairman of the "World Democratic Movement" and chief agronomist of the "Assinovskiy" State Farm; and B. Umayev, director of a base (nobody knows which base). Appearing on local television, representatives of the electoral commission complained that they are being hampered in the holding of the elections in many rayons. The stance of the All-National Chechen Congress Executive Committee was sharply criticized by representatives of the Ingush People's Council, who declared that they favor a unified Chechen-Ingushetia within the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and will insist on this, despite the attempt by the All-National Chechen Congress Executive Committee to break up the republic without the consent of the other peoples who live there.

At the last moment the Terek Cossacks also spoke up: At a gathering in Naur it was decided to hold a referendum on the question of transferring Naurskiy Rayon to Stavropol Kray. According to information, it is intended to adopt a similar decision in the Cossack Shelkovskiy Rayon in a few days' time.

A delegation of the Ingush people has returned from Moscow, where the question of restoring Ingush lands to the 1944 borders was discussed in an RSFSR Supreme Soviet commission together with a delegation from North Ossetia. Judging from information, an agreement was reached on a positive solution to this question. The only sticking point in the talks is the city of Vladikavkaz, the return of part of which the Ingush are demanding.

Rallies Protest Using Force

LD2210223191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 2000 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Two rallies which lasted many hours were held in the center of Groznyy today. The only link between them was that people attending both rallies were against using force to resolve the political situation in the republic. Supporters of the Executive Committee of the All-National Congress of the Chechen People assembled by the government building. Freedom or death—this was one of the main slogans under which this rally was held. The collection of funds for the needs of the National Guard continued here. Special marks were entered in passports, denoting republican citizenship and membership.

Those opposing this rally came out onto the former Lenin Square, or, as it is now called here, the Sheikh Mansur Square. They asserted that the adoption of citizenship itself and the elections scheduled for 27 October are illegal and demanded that they should be held on 19 November, as is stated in the law on the elections to the Supreme Soviet of what is already called the Chechen-Ingush republic, published in the local press today.

Kaliningrad To Cut Exports of Consumer Goods

PM2310094591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Oct 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Captain 2d Rank B. Gromak under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Veto on Exports"]

[Text] Kaliningrad—A decision was made a year ago by the Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet on measures to protect the oblast's consumer market. However, as the oblast soviet presidium concluded the other day, the way this decision is being implemented is unsatisfactory, or to be more precise it has slipped people's minds somewhat. Neither did the recently abolished oblast soviet executive committee do anything to secure the creation of a legal base to protect the oblast's economic interests or form appropriate structures, without which it is impossible to speak seriously about the reliability of barriers erected to prevent industrial goods and foodstuffs from flowing out of the oblast.

As a result the oblast soviet presidium has decided that, since the USSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic have recognized the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, it is necessary to set up customs posts on the border with Lithuania and limit the value of export goods and food to sums up to 200 rubles [R]. Moreover, the limit for Balts is R50.

Anything worth more than these sums will be confiscated and sold through the trade network. Persons who attempt to export goods illegally will be fined between R500 and R1,500.

For the time being the customs will operate on freeways only.

Islamic Culture Association Founded in Kazan

OW2310034191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1415 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] An Association of Islamic Culture holds its founding conference in Kazan, Tatarstan, on Tuesday and Wednesday [22 and 23 October]. The heads of Islamic cultural centers in Moscow, Kazan, Kiev, Omsk, the Ob region, Saratov and Simbirsk met recently in Nyagan (the Tyumen region), urging the Mufti Talgat Tadiuddin, head of the Muslim Board of the European part of the USSR and Siberia, to give assistance to the Islamic public movement.

The new association will coordinate the efforts of Islamic public centers in Russia, Tatarstan, the Ukraine and other republics

Formation of Far Eastern Republic Considered

OW2310025891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1415 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A meeting of the Far Eastern Association of People's Deputies which has opened in Khabarovsk is considering the formation of a Far Eastern republic.

An IF [INTERFAX] correspondent reports that deputies from Khabarovsk and Maritime territories, Sakhalin, Amur, Kamchatka and Magadan regions, the Yakut-Sakha SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Chukotka who spoke at the meeting criticised the leaders of the Russian Federation on failing to keep their promise to grant the Far East certain privileges essential for its economic development.

Valentin Fedorov, chief of the administration of Sakhalin region, suggested putting pressure on the Russian leadership by threatening to form a far eastern republic. This was necessary, he thought, to make the Russian leaders "more responsive to the needs of the Far East."

Komi Official Resigns Over Coup Accusations

LD2310025791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 2000 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Summary] The Komi Republic Supreme Soviet is to meet today and in November to discuss food supplies, winter preparations, and to adopt privatization, local self-government, status of people's deputies, and referendum laws. Rogov, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, resigned today because of deputies accusations that he supported the State Committee for the State of Emergency.

Tatarstan Persists in Fight for Independence

Parliamentary Talks To Resume

PM2310091791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 Union Edition p 1

[Untitled report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, POSTFACTUM, AND REUTER roundup]

[Text] The third round of talks between delegations of the Tatarstan and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviets is scheduled for 24-25 October.

This decision was reached by Tatarstan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] President Shaymiyev and Russian President Boris Yeltsin during a telephone conversation. The presidents discussed questions of political and economic relations. As Tatarstan SSR Vice President Vasiliy Likhachev told the seventh session of the Tatarstan Supreme Soviet, "an accord on preserving the common economic space and satisfying the national interests of people

living on the two republics' territories was reached as a result of the two previous rounds."

Paper Deplores Tone of Struggle

PM2210151791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 91 p 3

[Report by N. Morozov "View From the Region": "Tatarstan: People's Militia Banned"]

[Text] Kazan—Freedom Square in Kazan, where pickets clashed with the militia cordon guarding the Tatar Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet building, has cooled down since the blazing outburst by people supporting full independence for the republic. It was in many respects due to pressure from the demonstrators that the question of independence was put on the session's agenda. This pressure had another more dramatic result: Some 15 Ministry of Internal Affairs personnel were hospitalized.

The square has emptied, but awful pictures of violence and medieval fanaticism remain in the memory: howling guys in black masks, bloody faces, torn Russian flags.... The militia simply could not help but use their rubber nightsticks—how could they fail to retaliate when the custodians of order were being smashed in the face with flagpoles used as spears and coming under a hail of stones and sticks? Law-enforcement personnel were convinced that the clash on the square was planned. It was not for representation that buses set off from Naberezhnyye Chelny, Nizhnekamsk, and Almetyevsk to Kazan carrying select strapping guys from the so-called People's Militia. In the current situation the actions taken by Tatar President M. Shaymiyev, who issued a decree banning paramilitary formations on the republic's territory, are quite justified.

The question of independence for Tatarstan is on the lips of each of the republic's residents and concerns the future of several nations. But it is pointless to decide this by "fistfights." It would be hard for even the most eminent and wisest assembly to tackle this question. For instance, V. Belyayev, cochairman of Tatarstan's multiethnic "Accord" ["Soglasiye"] movement and member of the Tatar State Council, reckons that Tatar state sovereignty is only lawful as a derivative of the sovereignty of the people and not of the nation, leaders, or mob diktat. "Actually raising the question of adopting an act of independence at the session rather than by nationwide poll is anticonstitutional, illegal, and politically reckless," the parliamentarian points out.

You can, therefore, foresee how heated the debates involving deputies currently working in commissions will be. You could also sense that on the opening day of the session's work. Many people were surprised by the behavior of one clergyman when the chairman gave the floor to F. Bayramova, leader of "Ittifak"; with the words "She's a women, let her wait" this person went up to the rostrum and began to speak. When the mullah received a complaint from the floor, he said menacingly: "Come out one by one after the session and we will have a meeting...." Is that a fitting way to fight for the republic's freedom and thus for the freedom of the individual? Isn't that what the authors of the slogan "We will defend Tatarstan's sovereignty at any price" have in mind?...

You can also notice that the battle for sovereignty is taking another alarming direction: Some parties and public movements have awarded themselves the right to speak for the whole people and consider themselves to be the final arbiter of the truth. Here is just one recent example.... I quote the "Resolution of the Rally of Peoples of Tatarstan of the Independent Republic of Tatarstan" adopted on Freedom Square 16 October:

"Because VECHERNYAYA KAZAN has pursued antistate policy against Tatarstan's independence, the rally of peoples of Tatarstan resolves:

1. VECHERNYAYA KAZAN, by decision of the rally of peoples of Tatarstan, is to cease its activity and close down for kindling interethnic dissension.

2. The newspaper's offices are to be sealed.

3. The militia of the peoples of Tatarstan is to be tasked with implementing this resolution. It has been adopted unanimously."

You can imagine the reaction of VECHERNAYA KAZAN's journalists and 225,000 readers on being presented with a fait accompli....

In my opinion, no sober person of any nationality would oppose freedom, independence, and sovereignty for the state in which he lives. But freedom for some at the expense of freedom for others—freedom to think as you please and participate in shaping your state's policy—never lasts. And neither Allah nor God will forgive those who try to destroy the temple of accord that has stood for centuries.

How this realization is lacking in those who are trying once again to set Freedom Square ablaze and keep the people's chosen representatives in the clutches of rally-inspired diktat, which, as we have all seen, is far more terrible than totalitarian diktat.

Leader Urged To Declare Sovereignty

LD2210195791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2312 GMT 21 Oct 91

[By Vitaliy Dzhibuti and Nikolay Sorokin]

[Text] Kazan, 22 Oct (TASS)—An open letter to Mintimer Shaymiyev, the president of Tatarstan, was published in the SUVERENITET [Sovereignty] newspaper, issued by a committee of the same name in Kazan. The authors—the chairman of the coordinating council of the committee and the president of the Sh. Mardzhani society—state: "These are decisive days for sovereign

Tatarstan. You, as president, must frankly and specifically declare Tatarstan's full independence to the whole world. Because such a statement has not been made, even official representatives of the neighboring state speak as though Tatarstan is still part of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] today."

Further, the leaders of the public organizations "make recommendations" to the president: A law on the republic's independence should be adopted within a month; and they propose to the head of the republic that their own national guard, ministry of internal affairs and national security committee be set up to protect against armed interference from outside. Finally, they advise that a decree be issued which halts the functioning of the laws of the RSFSR and the former USSR on the territory of Tataria.

Tataria Continues Supreme Soviet Session

Sabirov Presents Economic Report

LD2210185891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 2000 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Text] Mukhamat Sabirov, prime minister of the Tatarstan republic, outlined the economic situation in his report to people's deputies at the session of the Supreme Soviet of Tataria. He announced that industrial output has fallen by 2.5 percent since the beginning of the year. There has been a shortfall in output supplied under contracts to a value of 519 million rubles [R]. Workers of the agro-industrial complex harvested 2.5 million tonnes of grain crops under severe drought conditions. This is insufficient for the republic, and a contract has been concluded for the purchase of wheat and maize from abroad. Foreign currency for this purpose comes from the sale of 1 million tonnes of oil extracted by the republic over and above the plan. The Cabinet of Ministers has also found an additional R200 million for the resolution of the social program.

Private Land Ownership Approved

LD2310024591 Moscow TASS in English 2238 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By Vitaliy Dzhibutiy and Nikolay Sorokin]

[Text] Kazan October 23 TASS—The Tataria's parliament on Tuesday [22 October] voted for private ownership of land in the republic.

A total of 31 hectares of land have been leased in Tataria since last May. Twenty-five cooperatives and 182 farmers own 16,800 hectares of land in the republic, which is 0.5 per cent of its arable lands.

The parliament has yet to adopt a law regulating the sale of land in the republic.

Yakutia Signs Pact With Baykonur Cosmodrome

OW2310034391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1415 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In the city of Yakutsk, Prime Minister of the Yakut-Sakha SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Kliment Ivanov and the deputy head of the Baykonur Cosmodrome Alexander Shumilin have signed a contract under which Yakutia transfers part of its territory for temporary use to the cosmodrome administration. A number of sparsely populated Yakut districts will serve as landing pads for the used parts of booster rockets.

Baykonur, for its part, undertakes to help Yakutia develop a space research program of its own and train Yakut astronauts.

External Affairs

Crimean Peninsula May Become Next 'Hot Spot'

LD2210201291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Excerpts] Unfortunately, the Crimean Peninsula may become the next hot spot. It is living today in the expectation of the next, third referendum. Before a report by our correspondent, here are details of the population census: Russians form 67 percent; Ukrainians form 25.8 percent; while to date there are about 160,000 Tatars.

[V. Plotnikov] The proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the secession of Ukraine, including the Crimea, from the Union, is the reason for this. It runs counter to the results of the two previous referendums, when Crimean residents spoke in favor of remaining within the composition of a single renewed Union. However, by proclaiming independence, the Ukraine parliament in fact ignored the wish of the Crimean residents. That is why passions with regard to a future Crimea flared. [passage omitted]

Advocates of different opinions form public movements, hold meetings, and conduct debates in the press. They completely drowned voices of those who believe that a referendum is inappropriate today. A referendum will be costly. In order to hold a referendum, first it is needed to adopt a law on a referendum in the Crimea. Its draft has been submitted to the next session of the Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

Parliament May Threaten Georgia With Sanctions

OW2210115891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1115 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] parliament may threaten Georgia with economic sanctions, unless that republic takes measures to settle the conflict in South Ossetia.

According to parliamentarian Valeriy Shuikov who attended a closed meeting of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium yesterday, Russia's parliament is expected on Thursday or Friday [24 or 25 October] to discuss the situation in North Ossetia in the light of the latest events in neighboring Checheno-Ingushetia and South Ossetia, and adopt an appropriate settlement resolution. RSFSR Supreme Soviet will urge the Georgian leadership to allow no further escalation of aggression in South Ossetia, or else face economic sanctions from Russia.

International Affairs

'Rossiya' Group Against Extraditions to Latvia

PM2310091591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Oct 91 p 4

[Appeal to President B.N. Yeltsin and to the Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies from members of the "Rossiya" RSFSR deputies' group: "Deputies' Appeal. An Unprecedented Action"]

[Text] The mass media have reported that officers of the Latvian criminal militia have arrested S. Parfenov, an employee of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and a former staffer of the Riga OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] in Surgut City on the territory of Tyumen Oblast, and conveyed him to the Republic of Latvia. They are also endeavoring to detain and deport to Latvia other staffers of the Russian militia who used to serve in the Riga OMON.

Replying 17 October 1991 to an appropriate inquiry from a deputy, RSFSR General Prosecutor V.G. Stepankov reported to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the former actions of the members of the Riga OMON, which, according to information from the prosecutor's office, contained indications of criminality. Regarding the collaboration of organs of the RSFSR prosecutor's office and the prosecutor's office of the Republic of Latvia, he referred to the departmental agreement of 22 May 1991, and also reported that, in exchange for the former OMON members being extradited to Latvia, the RSFSR is receiving criminals from Latvia who are being sought by us.

The explanations of the RSFSR prosecutor's office are untenable.

If such forms of cooperation between departments of different republics were explicable and justifiable in May 1991, today the situation is different. In August 1991 Latvia proclaimed state independence, which is recognized today by the USSR and the RSFSR. Diplomatic relations have been established between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Latvia. And now, at a time when complex questions of strengthening Russian statehood and its territorial integrity are being resolved, departments are carrying out an unprecedented action which cannot be evaluated as anything other than trading in Russian citizens and as a blow to the sovereignty and honor of Rossiya. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet's refusal 18 October to examine this question is a cause for regret.

Functionaries—this time Russian ones—have flouted Articles 31, 32, and 35 of the RSFSR Constitution, and also on Articles 10 and 11 of the Declaration on RSFSR State Sovereignty and Article 7 of the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship," which guarantees: "A USSR citizen cannot be extradited to a foreign state." There can be no doubt that the former Riga OMON members, irrespective of their nationality, are not citizens of the Republic of Latvia: The republic, having reacquired its independence, not only declared illegal the entry of USSR citizens after 1940 onto its territory, but also ruled out for "migrants" serving in the USSR Armed Forces, the Internal Troops, the USSR MVD, and the USSR KGB the possibility of acquiring Latvian citizenship even through naturalization, even in cases where they have long since been discharged into the reserve or retired.

Even if the connivance by the Union structures of the prosecutors' office and of the MVD at this arbitrariness can be attributed to their disintegration and ineffectiveness, the stance of the leadership of the RSFSR prosecutor's office and the RSFSR MVD is a cause for surprise and resolute protest.

In connection with the above, we appeal to the RSFSR president and to the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies to adopt urgent measures to defend the rights and interests of Russian citizens.

The top-priority measures, in our opinion, should be:

1. The immediate return to RSFSR territory of S. Parfenov as a Russian citizen and, if the need arises, his prosecution by RSFSR law-enforcement organs and under RSFSR laws.

2. The dismissal of the RSFSR and USSR officials who committed this unprecedented unlawful action from their posts and the institution of criminal proceedings against them.

3. The immediate abrogation of the interrepublic economic agreement between the RSFSR and Latvia in connection with the violation of human rights by the Republic of Latvia in the way it establishes republic citizenship.

4. Examination at the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies of the general principles of interstate relations between our republics.

Gorbachev Greets Entrepreneurs Conference

LD2210102991 Moscow TASS in English 0937 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has sent a message of greetings to participants and guests of a forum of entrepreneurs from central and East European countries. The forum opens in St. Petersburg today.

The message expresses hope for a "productive dialogue" that will help overcome the existing subjective and objective difficulties.

"Reputable business circles can and must draw on long-standing, traditional relations between our countries and the new exceptionally favourable changes, which have presented themselves on the European continent in recent years, for a free, mutually beneficial international cooperation," the message points out.

Yeltsin Receives Bulgarian President Zhelev

Leaders on Economic Cooperation

LD2210144491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1326 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By Vladimir Abrosimov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president, today received Zhelyu Zhelev, president of Bulgaria, whom he invited to visit Moscow, in the Catherine Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace. They began their tete-a-tete conversation at 1400, after which talks between the two delegations are to take place.

A meeting between Oleg Lobov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and Dimitur Ludzhev, deputy chairman of the Bulgarian Government, who accompanies the Bulgarian president, has already taken place this morning. It focused on issues of economic cooperation.

Commenting at the request of the TASS diplomatic correspondents on the meeting between the presidents of Russia and Bulgaria, Pavel Voshchanov, the press secretary of the Russian head of state, noted that at the meeting they had talked about new forms of economic cooperation, "taking account of the realities and problems existing both in Russia and in Bulgaria." I think, he went on, that solutions will be found which will suit both sides. The very fact of today's talks is evidence that there is "enormous mutual economic interest and attraction between Russia and Bulgaria." The partners have sufficiently integrated national economic potential. Despite the collapse of the CEMA, bilateral ties were, in the words of the RSFSR president's press secretary, fairly reliable and beneficial, something which was already understood both in Russia and Bulgaria.

This morning Zhelyu Zhelev viewed the historical sights of the Moscow Kremlin.

Delegations Conduct Talks

LD2210161191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1434 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By Vladimir Abrosimov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow 22 October (TASS)—Immediately following a private conversation between Boris Yeltsin and Zhelyu Zhelev, which lasted more than half an hour, expanded bilateral talks began in the Catherine Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace. The delegations are headed by the presidents of Russia and Bulgaria.

Taking part on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] side are First Deputy Head of the Russian Government Oleg Lobov and republican Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, and on the Bulgarian side, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers Dimitur Ludzhev and other officials accompanying the president of Bulgaria, who is in Moscow on a working visit at the invitation of Boris Yeltsin.

Opening the talks, the Russian president expressed satisfaction with the fact that the Bulgarian leader had responded to the invitation to visit Russia. We are beginning the talks, he said, not only to restore the dialogue between the RSFSR, the Union and Bulgaria, unnaturally interrupted over the last year and a half to two years, but also to supplement it with new undertakings. I think that this meets the interests of our peoples.

Boris Yeltsin expressed Russia's readiness to develop relations with Bulgaria on the principles of equality, respect for each other, and mutual advantage.

Sides Term Meeting Successful

LD2210173191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1630 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By Vladimir Abrosimov and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow 22 October (TASS)—"Our points of view have coincided to such a degree that I was somewhat embarrassed: Everything was like it used to be in the old totalitarian time when there was no difference in the opinions of leaders. But at present everything takes place on a different basis, of course." This is how Zhelyu Zhelev has commented on the Russian-Bulgarian talks which took place in the Kremlin today. The Bulgarian president is in Moscow at the invitation of Boris Yeltsin. After the completion of the talks with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president, he and Boris Yeltsin answered journalists' questions.

Both leaders gave a positive assessment of the results of the meeting, stressing the fundamental coincidence of standpoints on all the matters discussed. However, the press wanted to know whether any problems exist on which the sides found it difficult to reach agreement.

Yeltsin admitted that the RSFSR is interested in receiving larger supplies of foodstuffs from Bulgaria than at present, while Sofia, for its part, would like to receive more oil from Russia.

Replying to a question from TASS diplomatic correspondents, the RSFSR president said: "It is paradoxical, but after all the 'velvet' and 'nonvelvet' revolutions in the countries of East Europe, when they cut through the leash with which we had, most regretfully, dragged them along for many years, their relations with the Union were, as it were, severed." But the markets, he continued, were prepared with each other in mind. However, trade between the two countries has recently been cut to one-tenth. According to the Russian leader, another reason for this was that the leadership of the Union "feared these countries joining NATO, though this was not a serious doubt." Russia has chosen a different path, relying on direct contacts and agreements with the countries of East Europe. It is a matter of first restoring everything that was accomplished earlier, and then of developing processes further. Furthermore, noted Boris Yeltsin, consideration was taken of the fact that Bulgaria has gone further than Russia along the path of democratization.

A foundation for official interstate relations should be laid under direct contacts between Russia and Bulgaria, the RSFSR president noted. For this purpose a corresponding political declaration and concrete accords on mutual deliveries, profitable for Russia and Bulgaria, will be signed tomorrow. Our future relations will be built only on such a mutually advantageous basis, Boris Yeltsin concluded.

Zhelyu Zhelev shared this view. He added that "in the post-communist period" Russia and Bulgaria have been brought together by "an absolutely frank dialogue" and "identical goals." In his words, this circumstance precisely determines common views. Possibly, though, Zhelyu Zhelev went on, Bulgaria is slightly ahead in the sphere of economic reform as well as in certain mistakes in the course of its implementiation. The president of Bulgaria expressed hope that dialogue on this subject was useful for the Russian side, too, since it is to start this reform primarily by freeing prices.

Agreement Set for Signing 23 Oct

OW2210202391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1947 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After his meeting in Moscow on Tuesday [22 October] with the Bulgarian President Zhelyo Zhelev, Russia's President Boris Yeltsin told journalists that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and Bulgaria would sign on Wednesday [23 October] declaration and an agreement on mutual supplies of machines, equipment, raw materials and food products.

"We are trying not only to restore the relations that were cut short by peaceful and nonpeaceful revolutions in Eastern Europe, but also to move forward. Direct contacts between Russia and Bulgaria should be given the status of official intergovernmental relations," Mr. Yeltsin said

He admitted that some problems concerning mutual supplies could hardly be solved in the present situation "For example," he said, "we cannot provide Bulgaria with as much oil as it needs, just as Bulgaria cannot provide us with as much food as we need. But problems of this kind should not block our relations. We have done the main thing: We have laid a solid foundation for the further promotion of Russo-Bulgarian relations, including in the economic, social and cultural areas."

Japanese Trade Minister Arrives in Moscow

LD2110120491 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 21 Oct 91

[By Vladimir Titov]

[Text] Moscow October 21 TASS—Japanese Minister of Foreign Trade and Industry Eiichi Nakao on Monday [21 October] arrived in Moscow for a two-day working visit.

He will meet Ivan Silayev, head of the Interrepublican Economic Committee, and leaders of Soviet and Russian foreign economic organisations to discuss bilateral economic cooperation, including prospects for using part of Japan's aid to increase oil production in the Soviet Union.

Nakao is also expected to meet Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Kunadze Views Soviet-Japanese 'Concessions'

OW2310055291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Japanese 1400 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Text] On 17 October, Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama ended his official visit to the Soviet Union. During his visit to Moscow and St. Petersburg, he held a number of meetings with Soviet and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] leaders, including sessions with President Gorbachev and President Yeltsin. Radio Moscow correspondent Zunurov interviewed Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze, who participated in the two rounds of talks between Foreign Minister Nakayama and RSFSR Foreign Minister Kozyrev, on his general assessment of the Japanese foreign minister's Soviet visit. First, Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze appraised Foreign Minister Nakayama's visit as follows:

[Begin Kunadze recording in Russian, fading in Japanese translation; translated from the Japanese] Foreign Minister Nakayama's visit was conducted in a pragmatic and constructive atmosphere. I think we can say that the Japanese side made an extremely important concession

to us. On this point, I would like to stress that this concession did not come out of the blue, but, rather, it resulted from our sincere and positive activities. I am particularly pleased with the fact that the Russian Republic has played a leading role here. [end recording]

After giving this appraisal of Foreign Minister Nakayama's Soviet visit, Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze continued: In short, we can say that during this visit, the two sides made mutual concessions. We can expect that there will be substantial change in the nature and character of future Soviet-Japanese and Russian-Japanese relations. Aside from reflecting optimism on both sides, the talks in Moscow also proved that the search for a common language is not only necessary, but also possible.

Such was Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze's reply. Radio Moscow correspondent Zunurov next asked if various issues related to economic cooperation were taken up in the talks between Foreign Minister Nakayama and the RSFSR leaders. RSFSR Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze gave the following answer:

[Begin Kunadze recording] The Japanese Government proposed to offer credits and a total of $2.5 billion in government-underwritten insurance. The talks began with measures relating to this proposal. It is only natural for the Japanese side to be concerned about how this economic aid will be used, and whether this sum might not be wasted under the present unstable conditions. In this connection, the Japanese side proposed that a special committee be created to manage the fund. The proposal is for representatives of the Japanese, Soviet, and Russian Governments to sit as the main members of the committee. RSFSR President Yeltsin has already ordered Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev to start deliberations on the organizational setup of the committee. It is particularly important to pay attention to the fact that the activities of the committee will follow only the practical logic of the USSR. The committee's activities will absolutely have nothing to do with the negotiation process of the peace treaty. Therefore, speculations that the RSFSR is selling the Kuril Islands to Japan and direct criticisms against the Russian Republic will be refuted completely and directly. [end recording]

The above was Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze's reply. Radio Moscow correspondent Zunurov also asked the following question: It is no secret that the final conclusion on the relations between the USSR, the RSFSR, and Japan all depends on the solution of the territorial issue. What do you think of this?

Here is Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze's reply:

[Begin Kunadze recording] Of course, I understand that any major change is being linked to the resolution of the territorial delineation issue. In my opinion, there are more important factors that should not be overlooked. However, I think on the whole this issue is in line with reality. Actually, the solution of this territorial issue has become a so-called hostage of the aggregate bilateral relations of the past. Unfortunately, there has been a major lack of mutual trust and a strong tendency to suspect the other party of hostile conspiracies in these relations. I think in the past two or three months we have succeeded in effecting a decisive change in the underlying tone in our relations with Japan. This proves that a qualitative change in a favorable direction is taking place in these relations. I think this should be reflected in the resolution of the various issues relating to the signing of the peace treaty and the territorial delineation treaty. [end recording]

Such was Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze's reply.

Also, in a news conference held after the Moscow visit, a senior Japanese official praised the achievements of Foreign Minister Nakayama's talks, saying that a general assessment of basic views on the inevitability of promoting the signing of the peace treaty had been made, and that prospects for progress had become more optimistic than before. He also stressed the importance of the various proposals to activate negotiations on the peace treaty. In particular, a subgroup on the territorial issue will be created within the framework of the working group on the draft peace treaty. RSFSR Deputy Foreign Minister Kunadze is expected to head the Soviet side of this subgroup.

Kaliningrad Leaders Back Sakhalin on Kurils

LD2210181991 Kaliningrad Maritime Press Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] The Presidium of the Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies is to send the following telegram to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Presidium of the Sakhalin Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies:

The Presidium of the Kaliningrad Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies supports the stand of the leadership and population of Sakhalin Oblast on the South Kuril Islands. We consider that the current foreign policy and economic problems of Russia and the Union must not in any circumstances be solved by means of territorial concessions, and that the actions and statements of individual politicians should not artificially create additional hotbeds of tension and discredit the leadership of Russia in the eyes of the people.

Burbulis Meets Anti-Castro Opposition Group

LD2210230191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2100 GMT 22 Oct 91

[From the "Vesti" program]

[Text] An unprecedented event took place today. Representatives of the Cuban anti-Castro opposition were received at an extremely high level in Moscow. Gennadiy Burbulis, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] secretary of state, met a delegation of the Liberal Union of Cuba headed by its chairman, Alberto Montaner. An understanding was reached on establishing direct contacts between this Cuban opposition organization and the Russian leadership. At the end of the meeting, Montaner described Burbulis as a serious champion of the restoration of democracy in Cuba. It also was announced that a Committee for Freedom and Human Rights in Cuba is being formed in Russia. It will be headed by writer Yuriy Karyakin.

Belorussia

Shushkevich Interviewed on Economic Treaty

LD2210174191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Text] As you probably know, a few days ago eight sovereign republics signed a treaty on economic cooperation. This very important document was signed for Belarus by republican Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Stanislavovich Shushkevich, and it is with him that our correspondent Petr Makritskiy is speaking.

[Begin recording] [Makritskiy] Stanislav Stanislavovich, we have not seen the text of the treaty, so it is all the more important to hear your view. Tell us, what is the significance and the merit of the treaty on economic cooperation for all the republics that took part in the signing, and for our Belarus in particular?

[Shushkevich] I have here a copy of the text, already fully agreed and refined. Its meaning is very simple: We have fixed the rules of the game by which we can escape from the state of crisis in which the economy of the former Soviet Union finds itself. And I think that the fact that we have fixed these rules, and the fact that international expert opinion—I am not talking about Soviet expert opinion, where there is always an element of mistrust—but international financial, economic opinion; the points of view of various of the most authoritative specialists in the world are such that these are good rules for the game; this is quite clear to me. So it was with great pleasure that I affixed my signature. One has to play strictly by the rules. What is it that is giving rise to discontent at the present time? Apart from rights, there are certain obligations. We should not have a budget in deficit. We have to think about those social programs for which we have no money; we have to explain to our people what we can do and what we can not do; we have to look for ways of generating money for social programs, not ask someone for it. And I am convinced that an understanding of this treaty, and playing by these rules, will lead to positive improvements.

[Makritskiy] The conclusion can be drawn from this, and you have already actually said this, that the economic union is the first step along the road toward escaping from the crisis situation and reaching agreement. But this is in the event of the treaty working. What do you think—can we count on this?

[Shushkevich] Probably if we have said A, then we have to say B, too. That is, we now have to put the finishing touches with the greatest care to the agreements, without which the treaty...[changes thought] Well, this is to a certain extent a declaration, but a resolute, fine step, but all these agreements have to be refined. We have already fixed a minimum number of these agreements; there will clearly be 17-18 agreements. Intensive work is being carried out on them, and I think that it will be completed in a month at the latest. So the treaty has to begin working. [end recording]

Talks Begin on Lithuanian Bilateral Relations

LD2210173591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1300 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Talks between delegations from Belorussia and Lithuania on bilateral relations began today in Minsk. Vytautas Landsbergis, head of the Lithuanian parliament, is scheduled to address deputies of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet. It is also expected that Stanislav Shushkevich, head of the Belorussian parliament, will visit Vilnius on 24 October where the bilateral documents will be signed.

Landsbergis Views Talks

LD2210175591 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 1400 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] A Lithuanian delegation headed by Supreme Soviet chairman Vytautas Landsbergis arrived in the Belorussian capital this morning. Answering a BELTA correspondent's question on the visit's purpose and prospects of cooperation between our countries, the Lithuanian parliament leader said: "The goodneighborly and mutually respectful relations between our peoples are firm and long standing. But today, in the new conditions, they lack a concrete and business-like character. The purpose of the talks, which are to take place in Minsk and then in Vilnius, is to give relations an impetus. We will work on the main initial principles which will form the basis of declaration and other Belorussian-Lithuanian legal acts."

Before the talks began, Landsbergis laid a wreath on the Victory Square monument. A short business-like meeting between Landsbergis and Belorussian Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich took place. Afterwards, the talks between the delegations of the two countries began on a wide range bilateral relation problems.

PRAVDA Comments on Land Ownership Law

PM2110092191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 91 p 1

[Correspondent O. Stepanenko "Opinion" article: "Belorussian Parliament Takes a Decisive Step and Recognizes the Right To Privately Own Land"]

[Text] Minsk—So, the Belorussian parliament has adopted the law "On Recognizing the Right To Privately Own Land in the Territory of the Republic of Belorussia." This fact has been reported in the press and on television. Commentaries are optimistic in spirit: Private ownership of land will save the republic's agriculture, they say. But will it?

You do not have to be a scientist or, as Belorussian Supreme Soviet Chairman S. Shushkevich loves to repeat, an academic to establish the following basic facts.

The republic's collective and state farms are a good 10 times less well equipped per hectare and per worker than Western farms.

There is also another important point: expenditure. As the experience of neighboring Poland has shown, a 15-hectare farm needs resources of 600,000 rubles [R] at last year's prices to achieve standard output under the private farm system. That is 40 times more per hectare than a collective or state farm has at its disposal. Where are those kind of resources going to come from?

Meanwhile, I. Nikitchenko, corresponding member of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences and head of its Western Department, is calling for the creation of 10,000 private farms covering an area of 500,000 hectares in the next few years. Let us set politics aside for a moment and pick up a pencil. Taking Poland as an example, these private farms will need resources of R50 billion at today's prices. That is 10 times more than the amount generated by all of the republic's collective and state farms put together. However, in terms of land area, these private farms will account for only one-eighteenth of the republic's agriculture. Think about it: Far more resources will be required for one-eighteenth of the organism than for the organism as a whole. Surely this must be an economic utopia?

It is not only that the Law on the Right to Privately Own Land lacks economic foundation. It cannot be supported by historical or political arguments from the life of our country.

It fails to take account of the fact that there has been no private ownership of land in Russia—and that includes Belorussia—since the abolition of serfdom (except during a 20-year period in Western Belorussia).

Parliament's decision evades agriculture's basic problems. They have been raised by a number of deputies: The separate development of urban and rural areas, increased contradictions between them, and the wrecking of price parity and proportions in the development of their base. Under cover of increasing commodity output, the option of breaking up agriculture and destroying the countryside is being forced through. An option that will inevitably lead to an unimaginable increase in expenditure, poverty, and hunger. Not to mention other and equally important social consequences of dividing people.

This is not the first time the question of land has been discussed in the Belorussian parliament. Until now, there has always been a majority vote against the right to own land. But the new political situation has had its impact: So-called Democrats have gained the upper hand and they call the shots.

One significant detail is that the "Democrats" unanimously opposed a referendum on land being held among the peasantry. Be that as it may, in the end their point of view prevailed. The opinions of the Belorussian peasantry apparently count for nothing in their eyes.

Citizenship Eligibility Requirements Detailed

LD2210172491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] The new documents certifying citizenship of Belarus will contain no indication of nationality. Legislators have endorsed a law that prohibits requests, in any form, for an indication of party or ethnic affiliation. This law is radically different from similar acts adopted in other sovereign states of the former Union. It also does not contain the institution of dual citizenship. To obtain citizenship, one must live in the republic for seven years, respect local laws, and have the legal means of existence.

Moldova

Dnestr Appeals for Place in 'Renovated Union'

LD2210200891 Moscow TASS in English 1926 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—The parliament of Moldova's Dnester Republic on Tuesday [22 October] appealed to the federal legislature and the parliaments of Soviet republics to recognise it as member of a renovated Soviet Union.

The appeal says the Dnester Repubic and its statehood were restored after a referendum in the republic on September 2, 1990.

The Moldovan Autonomous Republic, which existed in the Dnester Republic as part of the Ukraine between 1924 and 1940, was incorporated into Bessarabia on August 2, 1940 by a Soviet parliament act to form the Moldovan Republic.

The Moldovan legislature said the decision was illegal and condemned the Soviet Union's occupation of Bessarabia.

The appeal says the Dnester Republic belongs to neither state after the Ukraine and Moldavia proclaimed independence.

Pridnestrovye Appeal for Union Admission Noted

LD2210202991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1821 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS)—The Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has appealed to the supreme legislative bodies of the country and the sovereign republics, asking to be received into a renewed union. The appeals to the people's deputies and parliaments of the country and republics, which have been distributed here, say that by the will of the people the formation of the Dnestr Moldovan SSR was proclaimed on 2 September 1990, and its statehood restored. The documents say that the referendums and the historical facts confirm the legality of the demands of the Pridnestrovye people where, from 1924 to 1940 a Moldovan Autonomous SSR within

Ukraine already existed. On 2 August 1940, the USSR Supreme Soviet formed the Moldovan SSR by joining the Moldovan Autonomous SSR to Bessarabia. This decision was illegal. A special decision of the Moldova Supreme Soviet about this also deems it illegal and declares the territory of Bessarabia "occupied by Soviet troops." Now, since Ukraine and Moldova have adopted independence declarations, the Dnestr Moldovan SSR is effectively outside the state formations of these republics, say the appeals.

Economic Treaty Signing 'in Principle' Favored

LD2210153891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1223 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 22 Oct (TASS)—"We have sent off a telegram to Mikhail Gorbachev confirming that, in principle, Moldova is in favor of signing the Treaty on the Economic Community." This was stated by republic Prime Minister Valeriu Muravski, speaking on national television on 21 October. The prime minister noted that signing the document is not only possible but necessary. Moldova is taking into account economic reality, the fact that its economy is integrated with other republics. He said that the output from Moldova's enterprises is not competitive on the Western market. And it has a vital interest in purchasing fuels and various raw materials in the East. A unified monetary system also obliges one to take a sober view of things.

The republic's head of government explained the delay in Moldova's signing the treaty by the fact that the leadership had had certain reservations over the latest version of the document. "It seems to us," he remarked, "that someone at the center is trying to give a political tinge to this document, which is economic in nature." The prime minister stated that, in the near future, the republic's leadership will look again at the latest version of the treaty and thereafter make its final decision. But in principle, Moldova is in favor of signing it. "There are those in Moldova who are dramatizing this issue, as it were saying 'If you sign this treaty you will place Moldova in servitude,' but that is not the case," Muravski stressed.

Ukraine

Prime Minister Supports Economic Treaty

LD2210093691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0035 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By Ukrinform-TASS correspondent Anatoliy Grigoryev]

[Text] Kiev, 22 Oct (TASS)—"The Treaty on the Economic Community should be signed by the Ukraine," the republic's Prime Minister Vitold Fokin, who has completed his visit to Brazil, told a UKRINFORM correspondent on 21 October.

The head of the Ukrainian Government denied reports appearing in some of the mass media that he had allegedly leveled criticism at the republic's decision not to sign the treaty. "I did not say anything of the sort, although I am convinced the treaty should be signed so long as our remarks are taken into consideration, as we have indeed been trying to agree," V. Fokin said. "According to data I possess," he continued, "most of the fundamental remarks have been taken into account. Therefore I do not see any reason not to sign such a document. We cannot now develop in isolation, because enterprises have links throughout the territory of the former Soviet Union." According to the prime minister, "an attempt to disrupt the signing of this treaty is attempted suicide."

Supreme Soviet Session Proceedings Detailed

LD2310134391 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in English 0100 GMT 23 Oct 91

[Excerpts] The session of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet continued its work today [22 October] in Kiev. The defense minister of our republic General Konstantin Morozov presented two bills to be considered by the parliament, on defense and on Ukraine's Armed Forces. [Morozov, in Ukrainian fading to English translation] My [word indistinct] of the draft law on defense underlines a peaceful trend of Ukraine's foreign policy on the principle of defense sufficiency in case of protection from aggression. The authors of the draft law had taken a notion, defense sufficiency, because it includes demands for Ukraine's Government to maintain the republic's defense capability, the quantity and quality of troops and armaments, according to the level of the foreign threat.

Konstantin Morozov pointed out that the military doctrine of independent Ukraine will proceed from historic realities of the day, that is nonviolation of the existing territorial integrity of all the states.

Ukraine is also against a revision of the borders with the neighboring republics. Its defense will exclusively be concentrated on protection of Ukraine's national interests. In this connection it is necessary to link the economic potential with the needs of the republic's army. Creation of the Ukraine's Armed Forces is a necessity which needs no approval. It is a logical consequence of the act on Ukraine's independence: [Morozov, in Ukrainian, fading to English translation] The main goal of this law is to implement into life the eternal striving of Ukraine's people for independence. To implement the process of creation of Ukraine's own armed forces. That it is why we decided to base all the articles of this law on the interests of the nation. As for the cases of using the Armed Forces for the purposes which are not connected with Ukraine's defense, we think it is for the Supreme Soviet to decide. We have stopped on the principles of a

centralized leadership, democratism [as heard], a voluntary principle of military service for professional officers. These principles will be in the foundations of the future professional army of Ukraine. We have preserved the principle of a general military duty of all male citizens of the republic, without which it is impossible to ensure a defense of Ukraine now.

Due to demands of the time Ukraine's armed forces have to be in a constant combat and mobilization readiness. To encourage readiness of military men to serve to their motherland we have left untouched the principle of guarantees and social legal protection.

Konstantin Morozov said that formation of the national army will take approximately two years. There will be three types of the Armed Forces—Army, Air Force, and Navy - with a strength of about 450,000 servicemen. This total quantity in the main will correspond to the international standards of civilized countries.

The enlisted citizens will take an oath for being loyal to Ukraine. The language of communication in the army will be Ukrainian and the military education will be based on the best national traditions of the Ukrainian people. And yet, said the defense minister, there are a lot of organizational difficulties today in the matter of creation of Ukraine's Armed Forces.

Among the primary obstacles is a resolute unwillingness of the top military officials of the former union to recognize the desire of Ukraine to have its own army. Bilateral negotiations are now being held actively. Things are moving very slowly but it is necessary to find a compromise, pointed out Konstantin Morozov.

These days some negative elements appeared in this respect. It may seem strange enough but they come from the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. Speaking yesterday at the opening of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet he said that if some republics decide to create their own armed forces constitutional sanctions will be used against them. [passage omitted]

Very important is also the aspect that Ukraine in the future wants to be a non-nuclear zone. So far in conformity with the decision of Ukraine's parliament the nuclear weapons located on its territory should not be removed from the territory of Ukraine. They should be eliminated in its territory upon agreement with the top military command of the former union. It is also necessary to communicate with the union command at the present stage about the joint control of nuclear warheads located in Ukraine but under supervision of Ukraine's parliament.

Consideration of those draft laws convinced the deputies that the bills were worked out very thoroughly. As a result of voting they were adopted in the first reading. It was a pleasant surprise for the Ukraine's defense minister to hear at the session that by decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet he was conferred the rank of colonel general.

Today the Ukrainian parliamentarians considered in the first reading two more draft laws. The thing is that the independent Ukraine will have its own national guard. It is a principally new structure which will perform functions on protecting the constitutional system in the republic, lives and freedoms of citizens. The national guard will be free from any ideological influence. The national guard will consist of 30, 50,000 [figures as heard] servicemen, mainly professionals who will serve there on contract. Women will be also admitted to the national guard.

Ukraine's frontier troops, exclusively men, will be a separate structure which will defend Ukraine's borders from possible encroachment from outside. As a matter of fact there still exist quite a few organizational problems, because at present the western borders of Ukraine are subordinated to the union command. Negotiations with the central top military officials will be tough because they do not want to make a compromise.

After consideration these two bills were approved in general and now they are to be finalized taking into account amendments and proposals of the parliamentarians at the standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet.

The deputies also positively evaluated the draft law on the state borders of Ukraine, primarily because this document is fixing de facto the territorial integrity of Ukraine in its present state frontiers. It also stresses that Ukraine has no territorial claims whatsoever to the neighboring states and republics of the former union. It stresses that the policy of good neighborly relations and friendship will be the basis of the foreign political course of the independent Ukraine.

And finally about appointments. The Ukraine's national guard will be headed by Colonel Volodymyr Kukharets and the frontier troops of Ukraine by Lieutenant General Valeriy Gubenko.

You've been listening to a report on the work of the session of Ukraine's Supreme Soviet which continued today in Kiev.

Defense Minister on Republican Forces

LD2310004591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2203 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Report by V. Lyaskalo]

[Text] The latest session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet began to the accompaniment of the slogans of independent trade unions, who are demanding the immediate protection of rights of working people, and of the Greens, who are calling for the immediate closing of the Chernobyl nuclear power station. The floor was offered to the trade unions, and the Chernobyl issue is also on the agenda.

However, the main work for the deputies today was discussion of a package of defense laws. This means,

strictly speaking, the actual law on the defense of the Ukraine and the laws on the Ukraine's armed forces, on a republican guard, on the state border, and on border troops.

A report was delivered by Ukrainian Defense Minister Konstantin Morozov. Answering a question on whether the Ukraine was planning to privatize three military districts and the Black Sea fleet all at once without prior arrangement, General Morozov stated that the nationalization of Union military facilities is a lengthy process, and that all this work will be done only in a coordinated manner with the Union general staff and Defense Ministry and in accordance with the legitimate rights of the Ukrainian people as envisaged by the resolution of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

'Strategic-Purpose Forces' Discussed

LD2210213891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1910 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Aleksandr Litinov and TASS correspondent Mikhail Melnik]

[Text] Kiev, 22 Oct (TASS)—Hundreds of people gathered near the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet building this morning. Representatives of the republic's independent trade unions came here with a list of demands aimed at the citizens' social protection. The "Greens" were demanding the urgent closing of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant.

Before the start of the morning plenary sitting, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk met with the picketers. He noted that the unions' demands are just and should be resolved urgently by the republican parliament.

In his conversation with the "Greens," Leonid Kravchuk emphasized that the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet made the decision to close down the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. Now the problem lies in its technical implementation. There already are preliminary agreements to that effect with foreign specialists. The parliamentary leader said that now all of the questions related to Ukrainian nuclear energy will be dealt with by the cabinet of ministers of the republic, and not by union departments.

As the pickets were promised, the question of Ukrainian trade unions was additionally included in the session's proceedings. The deputies also plan to examine this week a package of draft laws on the defense of the Ukraine, its armed forces, Republican Guard, frontier troops, the state border, the social and legal protection of servicemen and their families, and alternative service. They also will discuss a number of other important questions, specifically, the situation that has developed as a result of the signing of an economic cooperation treaty.

At the morning plenary sitting, the session gave its first-reading approval to the draft laws "on the defense of the Ukraine" and "on the armed forces of the Ukraine." Specifically, these laws stress the peaceful thrust of the Ukraine's foreign policy, which maintains its defense capability at a level sufficient to protect it against aggression. The republic's armed forces will consist of three arms: infantry, air, and naval forces. The draft laws foresee that, while proclaiming nonnuclear principles, the Ukraine will still have strategic-purpose forces for a certain time.

At the evening plenary sitting, the deputies gave their first- reading approval to the draft laws on the Ukrainian Republican Guard, the state border, and frontier troops. Colonel Vladimir Kukharets, the commander of one of the military formations, was appointed commander of the guard. Lieutenant General Valeriy Gubenko, who previously commanded the troops of the western frontier district, was made commander of the Ukrainian frontier troops.

Prime Minister Fokin Visits Brazil

LD2010121591 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 0100 GMT 17 Oct 91

[Text] Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitold Fokin continues his official visit to the Brazilian State of Rio de Janeiro. He was received today by State Governor Leonel Brizola and he also held talks with members of the local government and business representatives.

The prime minister of the Ukraine also had talks with Nelson Carneiro, chairman of the state's legislative assembly, during which they examined opportunities for economic and other forms of cooperation between independent Ukraine and Brazil.

The arrival of the head of the Ukrainian Government in this South American state is being evaluated positively in the leading newspapers in the Brazilian capital.

Trade Negotiations Noted

OW1810220191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1634 GMT 18 Oct 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Vitold Fokin, the Ukrainian premier, is currently on a visit in Brazil. DP [DIPLOMATIC PANORAMA] learned from the embassy of Brazil in the USSR that Fokin had been received by the Brazil President Fernando Collor de Mello in the course of the October 15-20 visit .

Currently Mr. Fokin is in the state of Curitiba that has a large Ukrainian community, where the Ukraine would like to open a consulate office. The talks in Curitiba cover Ukrainian-Brazilian trade and economic ties.

According to Brazilian sources, the Ukraine plans to reach an agreement on the sale to Brazil of oil-refinement technologies and medicine. From Brazil, the Ukraine would like to buy argicultural machinery and equipment.

Delegation Ends Visit

LD2110190591 Moscow TASS in English 1308 GMT 21 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vadim Khistov]

[Text] Brasilia October 21 TASS—A Ukrainian Government delegation lead by Prime Minister Vitold Fokin on Sunday [20 October] ended its official six-day visit to Brazil at the invitation of the Rio de Janeiro government.

The delegation met President Fernando Collor de Mello of Brazil and Rio de Janeiro business people and authorities. The sides signed protocols on trade, economic, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation between the Ukraine and the state of Rio de Janeiro.

Addressing a news conference, Fokin commented on the Ukrainian parliament president's refusal to sign the economic community treaty at the moment. He said he hoped that his republic will sign the document.

"Nobody can reach prosperity in isolation, and the Ukraine's isolation could lead to a tragedy," Fokin said.

Georgia

Gamsakhurdia Assails Democratic Reformists

LD2210212991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 Oct 91

[From the "TV Inform" newscast]

[Text] Two simultaneous rallies were held in Tbilisi today. One rally was held outside the parliament building, and the other was held outside the cinema house. In fact, Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia was the initiator of the first rally. He called the people to unity and cohesion which, he said, can overcome all obstacles on the thorny and bright way to freedom. At the same time Gamsakhurdia again criticized the Democratic Reforms movement and its branch in Georgia. As you know, this movement was set up in Moscow at the initiative of Eduard Shevardnadze. On this account Gamsakhurdia stated that the split of the nation and an attempt to foist the ideas of Communism on the Georgian people are the main aims of the movement.

Demands that the president of Georgia should resign, that a return to a parliamentary republic should be made, and that political prisoners should be released were again heard at the opposition rally. Tengiz Sigua, the former republican prime minister, spoke to those gathered.

Gamsakhurdia: Shevardnadze Imposing Communism

OW2210155391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Addressing a rally outside the government house in Tbilisi on Monday [21 October], Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia said that the party founded by Eduard Shevardnadze in Moscow and the newly born Georgian Democratic Movement would like "to break Georgia up and impose well disguised communist ideals on it."

The head of Georgia's Supreme Soviet Akaki Asatiani, who had just returned from an unofficial visit to Moscow, told the rally that "confrontation with the empire has been changing from political to economic." He predicted that the Georgians' living standards might notably drop in the near future.

Gamsakhurdia Warns of 'Lebanonization'

AU2210185591 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 11 Oct 91 p 1

[Speech by Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia at the extraordinary session of the Georgian Supreme Council in Tbilisi on 8 October: "'The President and Parliament and the Entire People should Harmonize Their Actions to Prevent Tbilisi From Becoming a Dead City and Anarchy From Reigning in Georgia' said Zviad Gamsakhurdia at the Extraordinary Session on 8 October"]

[Text] Dear Deputies! Dear Chairman! I want a frank discussion between us and the whole Georgian people on matters that are of concern to the nation, because it is precisely the embellishment and covering up of the truth that have led to the tragic events of which you are aware. I would immediately like to say that my speech should not be viewed as some kind of ultimatum or threat or the statement of a desperate person who has been brought to the brink. What I will now tell you is the reality, the objective reality. I will give you an unbiased assessment of the situation that has taken shape and will speak to you about the possible consequences of all this, as I have at my disposal considerably more information that any of you. I hope that you will not feel insulted by this reminder. At the same time, I would like to outline ways of emerging from the current situation.

As early as spring of this year, I was convinced that the executive power in our country, which at that time was represented by Tengiz Sigua, the chairman of the government, his deputies, and generally by various individuals belonging to the government, had clearly announced its intention to be insubordinate to me. This was expressed in the adoption of arbitrary decisions and disagreement with me on most important questions in the cadres' and other spheres. I will give you a concrete example. Arbitrariness has been manifested, primarily in questions related to the military sphere and the National Guard. It reached the point that, for all intents and purposes, a small state was created independent of me. As you know, they also had their own building with their army and administration, and they called themselves the government, chairman of the government, adopting most important decisions independently of the president, particularly in the military sphere. I emphasize this point, in particular, questions of financing the National Guard, its numerical strength, various questions connected with the guard, the question of a military procurator's office that was decided in a completely unconstitutional manner, as the guard is not an army, and we still did not have a war ministry. All these issues were decided arbitrarily. I saw that [Tengiz] Kitovani, the former commander of the guard, was, for all intents and purposes, trying to make himself no longer subordinate to me and was systematically not carrying out my instructions. He refused to follow any orders and recommendations. He was abetted in this by Mr. Tengiz Sigua. They were acting in concert and by mutual agreement. I tried to resolve all this through negotiations but in vain. They became more active in their insubordination, arbitrariness, and tyranny. In the summer, in the period leading to the so-called Moscow putsch—I ask you all to comprehend this well and coordinate with one another—it can be said that they had already switched to open actions that I would evaluate as direct confrontation with the president. They had already started to express their own views on cadres' policy. Moreover, they voiced

their intentions in a wholly open manner in the presence of other officials and did not carry out any of my instructions.

In spite of my repeated demands, Kvilitaya, Beridze, and other communist functionaries continued to work with them without hindrance. Persistently developing and intensifying this course of insubordination, they reached the point when Mr. Tengiz Kitovani directly turned to using threats. He had advanced the idea of seizing the television building even before the August putsch in the presence of several officials. He openly stated that if the television would not broadcast in the way that they wanted it to and if Mr. Tengiz Sigua's address were rejected (he had already prepared such an address directed against the president), they would take full control of the television building. Therefore, the idea of seizing the television building was already mature in the summer when I was in Kazbegi. I was informed of what was going on and returned to Tbilisi. Then, at a session of the Presidium, Tengiz Sigua read out, one can say, accusatory inferences directed at me; he made wholly unjustified and unworthy accusations against me, demanding that a number of officials and ministers be released from their duties. He used threats, spoke about the consequences, and about his resignation. I, of course, did not agree with this; those who were present at that session of the Presidium are here. Sigua intended to read out this address on television. All this was condemned and rejected, and I accepted his letter of resignation. Incidentally, it should be said that, prior to this fact, much earlier, he had said that, upon the election of a president, the former government always resigns, and the president creates a new government. He said that this is the practice everywhere, in all countries. This was the point of view that he expressed earlier. However, he subsequently changed his views: He stated that the replacement of the previous cabinet was in no way a logical necessity, and he started making threats. When he had written his letter of resignation, I issued a decree on this. Two days later, the putsch began in Moscow. Mr. Tengiz Kitovani went to Rkoni despite the fact that I insisted that he leave about 200 guardsmen in civilian dress as he had said that it was dangerous for youths dressed in their guards' uniforms to remain in the city and protect Parliament. He refused, again showing insubordination, and took the entire guard to Rkoni. Incidentally, I know that he conducted a parade there and, to divert attention, ordered the guardsmen to take an oath of loyalty to the president. What kind of loyalty could this be when Kitovani was not carrying out any of my instructions and orders and, for all intents and purposes, had established a military camp there that was subordinate to nobody and that was opposed to the president? All this subsequently developed into something even more serious and unpleasant. You remember that the camp he set up in Rkoni made contact and established ties with the local opposition that, having united, called for the direct overthrow of the government and established a powerful bloc. I am sincerely convinced that the incident of 2 September was directly linked with these events. I am certain that forces hostile to us, as can be seen, were acting on both sides. I emphasize this again: There were certain individuals, or an individual, also in the militia, who were helping members of the opposition and who were determining the nature of the actions—the start of the shooting, the dispersal of the meeting. I insistently repeat and maintain that these were their arbitrary actions the aim of which was to subsequently accuse the president of everything and to attempt to overthrow the government by force.

There was large-scale coordination between various forces; there followed provocative incidents, the arrival of the guard in Tbilisi, its deployment first in Shavnabada, then the seizure of the television building. Anarchy was developing. The crime situation in the city deteriorated considerably. It continues to deteriorate today. There were several armed attacks on state establishments, including the Supreme Council building. There have been casualties. The antigovernment forces have declared a direct armed struggle against us. This is called a rebellion in all civilized countries, a military and civilian rebellion or putsch. The term "putsch" is perhaps not accurate, and we are obviously not using this word in our resolution, but it expresses the essence of the phenomenon. This is no exaggeration and, in my opinion, if the Supreme Council respects itself and if it respects the country, as the highest legislative organ, it should qualify this phenomenon as a state coup or putsch. Friends, our activity is impossible and impermissible without such a qualification. If parliament intends to exist, it should tell the Georgian people the truth.

I now want to speak directly, frankly, and sincerely about the most important thing. There is much argument here about what kind of governmental structure there should be in Georgia, whether we should have a parliamentary or presidential republic, what form should presidential rule take—should it be limited or, on the contrary, expanded? There have been debates on this subject. I understand the views of the opposition, that opposition that still remains in parliament. There is also an external opposition that is expressing various views on these questions. I will set forth my point of view and will make analogies, something the members of our opposition are often so fond of doing. For example, there have been demands for my resignation. Everyone knows very well that I am not clinging to this post, and it is very difficult for me to carry out this responsible duty; it would be difficult for anyone in my place. Anyone would find this a heavy cross to bear. I state this with full responsibility, and, at the same time, I would like to tell you directly and frankly that I am certain that my departure from this post will result in the appearance of at least several dozen parallel governments and presidents in Georgia. Furthermore, this will be followed by the formation of several states. I state bluntly and without any exaggeration that Georgia will be torn to pieces. I beg you, members of the opposition, to think about this and draw your conclusions. You do not know and do not fully comprehend the

situation. I cannot make any kind of appeals to the street opposition that has lost its reason, but there are educated people here, and I do not want to be hypocritical. There are in our parliamentary opposition highly educated, very conscientious and, I would say, quite politically mature people, but when they demand the resignation of the president, they do not know what they are saying. This will, in the near future, result in the complete disintegration and destruction of the state integrity of Georgia as such and total anarchy throughout Georgia and particularly in Tbilisi.

Tbilisi will turn into a city divided into several areas, and sole power will belong to armed bands and their leaders. Each area will be under the control of one armed band and its leader. A struggle for power and spheres of influence will unfold between them, and an unprecedented robbery of the population will begin. There will be an unprecedented collapse, all structures—electricity, gas, communications—will be destroyed, the law-enforcement organs will cease to exist, the supply of foodstuffs will cease, and there will be no medical service. It is possible that Tbilisi will turn into a dead city and cease to exist. If anarchy reigns in Tbilisi, toward which these so-called members of the opposition want to push society, I repeat, there will arise several centers of power; one of these, the strongest, will be in the hands of the leader who has the most armed formations. The remainder will be scattered throughout different areas of Tbilisi. Thereafter, this tendency will spread throughout Georgia, and we will see in the country the beginning of the same "Lebanonization" that has been established on the territory of Tbilisi. As a result, there will follow phenomena completely different from those that certain people were hoping for, namely that Russia will intervene and Moscow will establish a military dictatorship here. This will not happen, as Russia is physically unable to do this in Georgia. Georgia will become the victim of total anarchy and Georgia's existence, its future in general, will be called into question. This is what could happen following my possible resignation that certain opposition parties are demanding so vociferously. I believe this thought has also become ingrained in the hearts of certain representatives of the parliamentary opposition. Everything that I have just spoken about does not represent a threat, is no exaggeration, is not an attempt to impose my point of view upon you, and, of course, is not an attempt to remain in this post at whatever cost. This is the reality, and I ask you to open your eyes and face this dangerous reality, gentlemen.

What needs to be done to avert a tragedy? Parliament should consolidate around the president, and the president and parliament should harmonize their actions. I do not mean a diktat and I do not want there to be any kind of diktat. It is essential to resolve elementary issues, restore order, and qualify the events that have taken place as a putsch or armed rebellion. We must be united on this point! The parliamentary opposition should support us in this if it does not want to appear as an ally of the putschists and participate along with them in the ruin and destruction of Georgia. This is what we must do, friends! By all means, let the parliamentary opposition criticize us as much as it wants and criticize me personally. As you can see, I am listening very attentively to their critical remarks and am taking stock of much of what they are saying but, on the question of Georgia's salvation, the restoration of order, and the establishment of civil peace, we must be united. If we do not unite on this matter, there is no sense in the existence of this parliament. I will say directly and frankly that I will be obliged to dissolve this parliament and will myself resign if you do not support me on the necessity of establishing order in Georgia, and I do not know whether this step will signify our salvation or our ruin. One thing is indisputable: There is no sense in the existence of either a parliament or a president who have no power in a country where armed bands are committing outrages and various crimes and where the state has no opportunity and no right to call them to account. A country in which anarchy rules needs neither a president nor a parliament nor a government!

This is how matters stand, friends. Let us not reduce everything to the absurd and to chaos. There was mention here of the possibility of rejecting the French state model and changing to the German model. However, friends, surely you know that a political system and government structure in any country are not formed without account being taken of ethnic psychology and national character? Why is it that a specific government structure was formed in France and a completely different one in Germany? Why are you are not taking this factor into account? I do not wish to compare myself with anyone, and do not claim to compare with De Gaulle. I want to remind you of history: When De Gaulle became head of the French Government after the war, the same kinds of events were imposed upon him as are imposed upon me today. De Gaulle resigned in 1946, and France became the victim of unprecedented anarchy. There was a new government every three to four months and then, in 1958, he was invited back by the National Assembly, and he established strong presidential rule without which France would have not survived. The national characteristics of the French are, incidentally, very similar to ours.

Regarding Germany, it has long traditions of state discipline and respect for state law and order. It is precisely as a result of these traditions that parliamentary rule was established in Germany and the Scandinavian countries, friends, and not because such a model was better. This corresponds to national character and ethnic psychology. It is difficult to imagine that Germany could have had such a president as De Gaulle or Mitterrand. When Hitler's authoritarian and dictatorial rule was imposed upon Germany, a rule that was alien to it, this destroyed Germany, that is to say the system should correspond to the national character. State rule should correspond to historical laws and characteristics and if we, as is the wish of certain people, reject the French model and

change to the German one, it is precisely this that will be the ruin of Georgia. Such a model is possible in the case of a large consolidated nation such as, for example, Israel, with which we will never compare ourselves as far as either consolidation or purposefulness are concerned, and Germany. A parliamentary republic is possible in these countries, but a parliamentary republic here would mean the ruin of the nation and of parliament. Remember this.

Presidential rule is the only means of salvation for our people. There should be a strong president and strong presidential rule. Remember that, without this, Georgia cannot exist, and everything that I have just been referring to will be established here.

Why are those deputies who are reproaching us, me personally, and the Presidium and are saying that we did not assess the Moscow putsch, not saying anything about the putsch in Georgia? In my opinion, this is astonishing. They now have one way out: to actively support us in our assessment of these events and thereby rehabilitate themselves. Let us adopt a single position on the putsch, condemn the attempted coup, and talk about constitutional opposition.

Representatives from Great Britain asked me: How did the opposition join up with the representatives of the armed formations and, together with them, oppose you? In the British Parliament, the opposition cooperates with the ruling party, and they act together for the sake of the nation's best future. My answer was as follows: Unfortunately, this happened because we still do not have genuine democracy. That is right, we do not have genuine democracy. Real democracy means the unity and harmony of the actions of the government and the opposition. Yes, gentlemen, I can allow criticism and harsh evaluations but not a struggle with weapons in one's hands! Let us overcome this, and then we will save our parliament, gentlemen. We will save our parliament and our Georgia, as there is no other solution for us!

I do not want to take up a lot of your time. I could speak at length about the September events and probably will at some time. However, I repeat, let us admit the following: Let us not hide the fact that today we have taken a big step. There were many worthy persons also among the Communists. I think that we should allow back all those who will serve the nation. We should not allow back those who are unworthy.

Parliament is today acquiring a more competent image. Obviously, quantity also has great significance. I will remind you that our struggle with the Communists initially involved quantity; let us now begin the struggle for quality, let us establish constitutional unity between ourselves and the opposition, the search for a common language, and respect for one another's opinions.

I am not opposed to the sharpest of debates provided they are within an ethical framework. We must have discussions within a constructive framework. Let us today give an appropriate assessment of all the events, adopt a corresponding resolution, and restore civic peace and order in Georgia!

That is the essence of my proposal today.

Armenia

Ter-Petrosyan Makes First Legislative Address

LD2210111791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0812 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Levon Ter-Petrosyan, first president-elect of Armenia, has not yet taken up his duties, but the popularly elected president of the republic made his first address on 21 October at the session of the Armenian parliament. Our Yerevan correspondent Armen Dulyan phoned in this report:

[Dulyan] By law, he was to have taken up his duties in the first half of December, but the deputies decided to make an exception for the first president and to hold his inauguration at a special sitting on 11 November. Speaking in parliament, Levon Ter-Petrosyan declared that he considers it to be his main task to strive by all possible means for the full political independence of Armenia, and at the same time for it to take the maximum part in all creative processes taking place in the former union. The president of Armenia has not yet taken up his duties, but we already know what his salary is—4,000 rubles [R] a month; the chairman of the Supreme Soviet will receive R3,100, and the vice president will get almost as much. Deputies' salaries have been doubled.

Up to now, relays of all plenary sittings of the Supreme Soviet have been broadcast in full on republican television. This will have to be given up now. Owing to the energy crisis, in the next few days the government will cut television broadcasting to three hours. Acting chairman of the Council of Ministers Grant Bagratyan announced that the republic's power engineering situation has never been so severe. A number of major associations are at a standstill. Many enterprises are on the verge of bankruptcy, which will in a month or two lead inevitably to mass unemployment. This situation is one result of the chronic blockade by Azerbaijan. The major part of the fuel, about 80 percent, has to be transported by the Georgian railway, the throughout capacity of which is small.

The deputies started discussing the law on citizenship. The proposed draft stipulates that all persons born and permanently resident in the republic's territory are recognized as citizens of Armenia. Dual citizenship is also permitted, but this point gave rise to serious objections. In any event, the deputies commented, the interests of representatives of the diaspora abroad must be taken into account, for Armenia is one of the most ethnically homogenous countries; while at the same time, more

Armenians live outside its boundaries than inside the republic itself. The discussion of the draft is still continuing.

Azerbaijan

Negotiator Says Armenia Must Rescind Acts

OW2210203791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1947 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Rasim Musabekov, Azerbaijani president's adviser on inter-ethnic problems, who took part in the recent round of Armenian-Azerbaijani talks in Kazakh, Azerbaijan, in the presence of observers from Russia and Kazakhstan, has said further constructive dialogue can only be possible if Armenia rescinds all of its "anti-constitutional" acts on Nagorno-Karabakh.

In his interview for the republican press, Mr. Musabekov said the Armenians had been told in Kazakh that the Karabakhi conflict was an internal affair of sovereign Azerbaijan. He said the next round of talks, due on Armenian territory next Friday [1 November], would hear the demand that all unlawful armed units be withdrawn from the conflict zone.

Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast

Peacekeeping Force Deployment Suggested

OW2310023191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1415 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After a trip to Nagorno-Karabakh and the Armenian-populated Gheranboi (formerly Shauoyanovsk) district of Azerbaijan, the delegation of the Christian Solidarity International led by the British MP [member of parliament] Caroline Co has called for the deployment of an international, possibly UN-sponsored, peacekeeping force in the region.

A press release summing up the delegation's stay in the USSR stresses the need to return deported Armenians to their villages and ensure their physical integrity and normal living conditions. The delegation believes all paramilitary units in Nagorno-Karabakh must cease fighting, and Soviet interior troops must keep peace in the region.

The Christian Solidarity International calls for the release of all hostages and restoration of transport and communications in Nagorno-Karabakh, the re-opening of Stepanakert airport and resumption of air flights to Yerevan.

Shots Fired at Interior Ministry Helicopter

LD2210161891 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert October 22 TASS—An Interior Ministry helicopter came under automatic gunfire on Monday [21 October] afternoon on the border between the Nagorno-Karabakh and the Gadruty regions. It was carrying food supplies to army camps in the blocked Armenian villages of Khtsabret and Khintaglar.

The crew commander informed TASS of bullets damaging one of the blades and radio equipment. Despite the damages the helicopter made it to the airbase.

Generally the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh continues to be unstable, despite the continued presence of a group of observers from Russia and Kazakhstan. The almost now ritual hostage taking goes on and settlements and military sites come under regular shelling.

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev Supports 'Association' Based Union

LD2310025191 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations October 22 TASS—The USSR's future lies in creating an association of states fashioned on the British Commonwealth, believes Kyrgyzian President Askar Akayev. Addressing a news conference at the United Nations on Monday [21 October], Akayev said a treaty on political union of sovereign states can become reality if it envisages the creation of such an association.

Touching upon the treaty on an economic community signed last Friday [18 October] in Moscow, Akayev said the treaty still presupposes the intention to revive a centre that would issue directives. "We have always objected to this", he said. The treaty's juridical basis is far from perfect. Kyrgyzhia has signed it nevertheless. It is important for the treaty to be a symbol of peace between sovereign republics, a symbol of our common striving for good relations and cooperation", he said.

The president said all the republics have a right to apply to join the United Nations. Kyrgyzhia looks forward to entering the U.N. "However, this should not be done straight away, but after following a certain path and making our sovereignity reality", he said. Kyrgyzhia has adopted a declaration of sovereignty. Now it should adopt a law of independence, then hold a referendum and seek recognition from the world community, he said.

The United Nations can play an important role in ensuring stability in various regions of the Soviet Union, he said. Events similar to those taking place in Yugoslavia are quite possible in Central Asia, where Kyrgyzhia is situated. There are many reasons—demographic boom, lagging economic growth, and ethnic strife, he said. Akayev said he does not preclude the United Nations' participation in settling acute ethnic conflicts in the USSR.

Economic Situation 'Drastically Deteriorating'

OW2310012591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Government of Kyrghyzstan reported on Tuesday [22 October] that the republic's economic and financial position "is drastically deteriorating." During the first 9 months of 1991 Kyghyzstan's national income decreased against the same period of last year by 5%, the GNP by 7%, and agricultural output by 13%.

The Cabinet of Ministers says Kyrghyz enterprises have concluded only 14 of the target number of agreements with kin enterprises in other republics. Many may find themselves without material and technical resources next year.

The Cabinet calls for urgently drafting "a specific program of state assistance to private businesses" and for liberalizing the republic's foreign economic relations with a view to ensuring the large-scale influx of foreign-made goods and foreign investments into Kyrghyzstan.

Tajikistan

Presidential Elections Postponed Until 24 Nov

LD2210153991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Text] Elections for president of the Republic of Tajikistan will be held on 24 November, almost a month later than the date set previously. This decision was passed at the session of the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet which ended today. The republic's parliament also lifted the ban on setting up religious parties. The issue of a nationwide referendum on confidence in the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet was dropped from the agenda.

Muslim Leader Comments on Aspirations

LD2210171491 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1630 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Video report from Dushanbe by correspondent Klimov—from the "TV Inform" Newscast]

[Text] [Klimov] It is no longer possible to imagine the disposition of political forces in Tajikistan today without the young Islamic Revival Party, an integral part of the democratic movement. It is no surprise that the agenda of the session of the Supreme Soviet that opens tomorrow includes abolishing legislative acts of the Republic of Tajikistan banning parties of a religious nature. One can assume that the influence of such parties on politics and on the adoption of state decisions will become increasingly weighty. Muslim positions have been strengthened by the opening in Dushanbe of the Tajik Islamic Institute. This is causing concern among many. Surely there is not going to be movement back toward medieval times.

We are now in the office of Kazikhan Khodzhi Akbar Turadzhonzoda, deputy of the republic's Supreme Soviet and head of the Muslims of Tajikistan. [addressing Turadzhonzoda] Does your activity have as its aim the creation of an Islamic republic?

[Turadzhonzoda] Many people have asked that question and I always say no, unequivocally. I favor religion being separate from the state but being free in its actions, just like other religions, incidentally.

[Klimov] And how do you foresee coming events in the republic?

[Turadzhonzoda] As they say, everything is in the hands of Allah, but I hope that our people will bear in mind the mistakes that have been made in other republics during the stormy political changes that have been taking place in our country, and that we will avoid such mistakes and build a democratic society, a truly democratic society, we are convinced that only in this way can we get ourselves out of the economic chaos which we are in.

Supreme Soviet Lifts Islamic Party Ban

OW2310012791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1930 GMT 22 Oct 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Tuesday [22 October], the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan lifted the ban on the political activity of the Islamic Revival Party and other religious organizations. MPs [members of parliament] took a decision to that effect after a second round of voting which at the initiative of the republic's Muslim leader Akbar Turadjonzoda was held on a roll-call basis.

After Mr. Turadjonzoda said in his address to parliament that "the voters should know who of the MPs does everything possible to destabilize the situation and lead the republic to a civil war," 112 of the 188 parliamentarians voted for the abolition of the laws restricting the activity of religious parties.

The Tajik Supreme Soviet turned down the opposition demand to check the degree of popular trust in the republican parliament by holding a referendum simultaneously with the presidential elections scheduled for November 24.

Turkmenia

Niyazov Comments on Economic Treaty

LD2210184691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 21 Oct 91

[By correspondent Mukhammed Muratliyev]

[Text] Ashkhabad, 21 Oct (TASS)—"It is essential that cooperation between republics should be built on mutual respect and the precise fulfillment of all obligations," Turkmen President Saparmurad Niyazov stated at today's republican Presidential Council meeting.

Having reported briefly on the course of the signing of the treaty for an economic community of sovereign states in Moscow, he noted its significance in restoring the disintegrating links between the republics for an emergence from the crisis situation, and stressed that the treaty calls for the precise fulfillment of all points of the economic agreement.

"Turkmenia is counting on the honorable fulfillment of the conditions of the agreement. If any of the republics does not carry them out we will begin to apply economic sanctions," President Niyazov said.

The leader of Turkmenia expressed regret that Ukraine had not signed the treaty.

Democratic Party Meets To Outline Program

LD2110201491 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 21 Oct 91

[Text] Moscow October 21 TASS—A constituent congress of the Democratic Party of Turkmenia was held here on Sunday [20 October]. The congress approved the rules and the program of the party.

Chairman of the Congress Presidium Durdy Murad Khodzha-Mukhammed Ogly told TASS that the Turkmenian Democratic Party is an independent political organisation of a parliamentary type.

It aims to build a democratic society in Turkmenia. In the sphere of the economy, the party calls for making land the property of farmers, and industrial enterprises and services—the property of private owners.

The party suggests to dissolve the republican Supreme Soviet, introduce a multi-party system and hold new parliamentary elections on this basis, in order to overcome the current crisis.

Touching on the reasons for holding the constituent congress in Moscow, Durdy Murad Khodzha-Mukhammed Ogly said that the authorities did not allow to do it in Ashkhabad.

Uzbekistan

President Karimov Joins New Party

LD2310030191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1526 GMT 22 Oct 91

[By UZTAG correspondent Irina Grebenyuk]

[Text] Tashkent, 22 Oct (TASS)—Uzbekistan President Islam Karimov has joined the People's Democratic Party of Uzbekistan (PDPU). The organizing committee for convening the PDPU's constituent congress reports that so far it has already received over 250,000 applications from former CPSU members and about 55,000 applications from citizens who have not previously belonged to any political organization.